



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

***Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record***

FBIS-SOV-89-137-S
Wednesday
19 July 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-137-S

CONTENTS

19 July 1989

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 1, 2 Jun	1
Eighth, Ninth Sessions [IZVESTIYA 4 Jun]	1

Congress Proceedings Continue 1, 2 Jun

Eighth, Ninth Sessions

18300679 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-7

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline; conclusion of the transcript of 1 June eighth session proceedings, continuing on into the first part of 2 June ninth session morning proceedings]

[Text]

Eighth Session (Continuation)

B.Ye. Paton: I give the floor to Deputy Gustov.

V.V. Gustov, oil and gas production foreman in the Mamontovneft Oil and Gas Production Administration, Yuganskneftegaz Production Association, Nefteyugansk City, Tyumen Oblast, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] (from the trade unions of the USSR): Comrade deputies! Tyumen Oblast has finally made it to the rostrum. I did not have to notify Tyumen to close the valves on the gas pipelines.... Comrades, I will not explain what Tyumen Oblast is and what it means to our whole country, in particular the economy. Everyone knows about it. But I do want the country's parliament finally to realize something, namely that the country's main oilfield is on the verge of its latest crisis. It's as if many problems were piling up on each other in this vast region. Especially acute is the social problem. Some 17,500 families of oil workers are huddled in huts and other temporary structures. Under the conditions of the Far North and its marshes! Medical services leave much to be desired. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Decree No 797, adopted in 1985, is not being implemented. The construction organizations which were sent in accordance with the decree to deal with the problem of housing and social, cultural, and service facilities, are leaving. The oil workers' trade unions are very disturbed by this, and we demand an answer. Against this background, the petrochemical industry that is being brought into the region has a kind of negative look to it. Without having solved one problem we immediately pile on another. In short, we already have people without homes, and immediately start breeding others. A total of 41 billion rubles will go to build new chemical enterprises. It is calculated that this will require bringing at least 700,000 persons into the region, and there are already over 3.5 million persons in the oblast—more than twice the growth of 20 years. As a result, oil workers' facilities will have to be cut back.

Who comes up with these ideas? I think it must be people who are ill-informed and not fully competent, people who conduct armchair strategies; it is evidently they who are thoroughly confused as to whether the northern fields need to be developed or not. Just think, they assume,

how many billions of rubles have been dumped here already. Hundreds of thousands of people have been forced to live and work under terrible conditions.

What has the effect been? The gusher period in Western Siberia has given rise to a sloppy attitude toward fuel. Trading in oil, we have failed to ensure the competitiveness of our machine-building products in foreign markets. The conclusion is to cut back capital investments in the Tyumen oil fields. But do we have anything today that we can substitute for "black gold" on the foreign markets? For some reason, science has been silent, turning the possibility of judging our affairs over to people who are not adequately in possession of the facts, although science, with all the facts at its disposal, should have said whether, for example, the state could earn foreign currency from something other than Tyumen oil. Having produced 149 billion foreign currency rubles' worth of oil for export in the past six years, the oil workers have been left with nothing.

On 5 January, MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA printed an interview with Comrade Salmanov, first deputy minister of geology of the USSR, under the heading "Is the Earth Running Out?" It is a timely question. As is well known, we are extracting 600 million tonnes of oil and selling a considerable portion of it abroad. This is disquieting. Against this background, Comrade Salmanov's claim that our country is fabulously rich in oil and gas, which is not backed up by any serious arguments, sounds strange. It creates the false notion of an unlimited supply of valuable fuel and raw materials. Also doubtful is the esteemed geologist's claim that if we produce 700 million tonnes of oil per year it will eliminate lines at the gasoline pumps. Why this ballyhoo? We are no longer fabulously rich at all and are at the limit of profitability. I have been working in the oil fields for more than 20 years and I can see what this leads to. Do we really want to be in the situation that developed in late 1983 and early 1984? At the time we forgot about everything and, under the slogan "Oil at any cost" we pursued our cherished goal. One million tonnes of Tyumen oil per day. Yes, we did produce a million tonnes per day, but only for a day, and then we rolled back, because there was emptiness ahead; there was no material base. People were pushed into the background, with oil in the forefront. In short, we lacked a strong infrastructure, namely social, cultural, and service facilities, housing, and working conditions. And that immediately affected the whole country.

In September 1985, the oblast was visited by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. He brought with him many ministers, including those of the machine-building industry. They saw the kind of equipment we were working with, metal-intensive and obsolete equipment.

At this point let me say a word about the ecology. What are we going to leave to our posterity? Oil-covered taigas, marshes, rivers, and lakes. I support Comrade Sharipov's proposal that the Committee for Environmental Protection be made subordinate to the USSR Supreme Soviet rather than the Council of Ministers.

The program for the technical retooling of the oil sector of Western Siberia, which was mapped out in Surgut in that same September of 1985 with the participation of executives of the key machine-building ministries, has in effect been stymied. Out of 64 types of new equipment of cardinal importance to the oil and gas complex, we have been given only one new item—a monitoring-measurement device. Of three highly productive gas lift stations of the Sumy Association of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, which were supposed to go into operation in 1987-1988, not one is in operation because of flaws in design. More than 100 million rubles are frozen. These problems could have been solved if our enterprise had had the chance to purchase equipment from abroad, as the Law on the State Enterprise permits. Although this chance was given to other enterprises by the Bureau for the Fuel-Energy Complex, acting for the USSR Council of Ministers, the oil sector was deprived of this right. A condition was set forth: The oil enterprises could export 20 percent of their above-plan output if all the ministries met the target as a whole. A typical example of coverup [krugovaya poruka]. Today it is hampering the initiative of even the successful enterprises. If it were not for the ministerial veto, these enterprises could help the lagging ones. Everyone would gain.

If we had the hard currency, we ourselves could deal with many social tasks without having to go through all the higher echelons, but these issues keep getting bogged down in the echelons, as if they were the Tyumen marshes. What is the matter? Who will explain it? Although we have repeatedly appealed to comrades Ryzhkov and Maslyukov, the question remains unanswered.

Technical backwardness defines the intensive development of the region's oil sector. Let me tell you from my own experience. In the brigade where I work, labor productivity is rising, except it's not from automation and new equipment—we don't get any; we have achieved it by increasing the number of servicing facilities. They keep demanding more and more oil from us, and the 1989 state target already exceeds the original one that was stipulated in the five-year plan. Besides that, there are additional targets for centralized deliveries. Theoretically the Tyumen oil deposits are capable of that kind of output, but the trouble is you can't get that oil with your bare hands.

A word about state orders [goszakaz]. The oil workers have a 100-percent order. For most of our suppliers, however, it is set at 30 percent. And now many of them have informed us that they are taking items which we have ordered out of production. With the transition to cost accounting, these items are no longer profitable. Others have set forth demands that cannot be met—asking for construction materials, cranes, and passenger vehicles in exchange. And the Mytishchi Plant has decided to make the oil workers pay for its dump trucks with hard currency. But if we did have hard currency, we would probably not run to them with outstretched hands. Let state orders be just that for all suppliers, 100 percent.

Comrade deputies! Tyumen Oblast today is one of the least well provided with housing, hospitals, schools, preschool child care institutions, and cultural facilities. It is sufficient to note that the city of Nizhnevartovsk, with a population of 240,000, whose oil fields are producing more oil than all the associations of the country's European region, has only one movie theater, which was built in the 20th year of the city's existence. There is no drama theater in the city. Very little progress has been made in the development of the social sphere of the other cities of the Tyumen North, especially Nefteyugansk, which has no construction industry base of its own at all, and the construction units of the Ministry of Power and Electrification are leaving the city and the region. Thousands of oil workers are still living in temporary structures. Builders, geologists, and workers of other sectors ought to be brought in. The fact that social problems have not been resolved is the main reason for the precrisis situation in the region's oil sector. In light of this, we cannot understand the government's decision to reassign the construction units of the Ministry for the Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises and the ministries of USSR Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction] to gas complex projects.

In conclusion, comrade deputies, I would like to make this point. There is probably not a single republic or oblast today which is not getting Tyumen oil and gas. Yes, nature saw fit to endow our harsh land with that wealth, and we consider it our duty to share it with all the regions of the country. At a price which is not very high—23 rubles per tonne. The world price is 17 dollars per barrel—that is, five times as much. In return, we are getting drilling rigs and equipment from Sverdlovsk and Volgograd, pipes from the Ukraine, and oilfield equipment from Azerbaijan. Rotating brigades come to work with us from Tataria, Bashkiria, Belorussia, and other republics. We work harmoniously and do not quarrel. Under cost accounting [khozraschet], however, it is necessary to calculate just what each region gives and gets, like any good managers.

The problems I have touched upon here affect others besides Tyumen. They are typical of all other regions in which so-called strategic sectors predominate—oil, coal, gas. In the context of examining problems of regional cost accounting and the restructuring of the administration of the national economy, it would be advisable to review the priority creation of consortium-type economic associations in such regions, exercising broad economic and management powers.

Comrade deputies, the deputies from Tyumen also include agricultural workers; they have asked me to say that they took part in formulating the appeal to the congress. With their peasants' group they fully and wholly support the appeal and hope that it will be passed by the congress and that all its provisions will be given the force of law in the near future. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, the floor is turned over to Vitautas Vitautovich Landsbergis.

V.V. Landsbergis, professor in the State Conservatory, Vilnius, Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] (Panevezhis City National-Territorial District, Lithuanian SSR): Honored congress, esteemed chairman! All of us here ought to try to understand one another, to perceive the common goals and appreciate the noble aspirations of each. This will reflect political culture as a component of the people's all-around culture.

The Baltic republics' striving to strengthen their sovereignty and develop and regain statehood is the way to emancipate the people's creative forces, one of the goals of restructuring. A gain along this path is a gain for everyone—just as it is with, for example, the concept of the republics' economic independence that has been formulated in the Baltic region. This concept has already acquired the force of law in Lithuania and Estonia, and has now been submitted to the congress in the form of an all-union bill which, the way we see it, is useful to all the republics. It would be a shame for it to languish in a heap under the heading "Miscellaneous."

The problem of mankind's survival, which Mikhail Gorbachev has placed higher than individual state, class, and ideological interests, is coming to be realized more deeply. Nevertheless, it is being dealt with in a specific place—in Lithuania, for example, which already finds itself under the axe of ecological catastrophe. And the problem of survival is coming to be understood by people of all nationalities, just as cost accounting, the struggle against inflation, and a more stable and more secure life are understood. This is why the attempts of the anti-restructuring forces among us to sow suspicion, fear, and ethnic strife have been relatively ineffective.

Restructuring, alas, is accompanied by the heavy burden of the old domestic political thinking. The new thinking is, rather, for export so far. Perhaps the domestic "market," smothered under quotas, is not yet ripe for it. Or perhaps it withered during the prolonged stagnation. The old thinking weighs especially heavy on a range of ideas relating to the rights of peoples and republics. It is not by chance that these problems have been most neglected on the theoretical plane, while the practical pronouncements of the central leaders, unfortunately, have not been free of psychological errors.

The wisdom of the Russian people "got wise to" this method of thinking long ago, characterizing it with the bitter sarcasm of folk sayings like "the bosses know best" and "power doesn't need brains." The insight and generalizing capaciousness of these sayings with regard to state policies—for example, with regard to the convulsions of the economy, or the tragedy of Afghanistan—are worth many years of effort by social science institutes.

Relations between the center and the republics, conducted on the customary pattern of "bosses and underlings," have long since become outmoded morally, politically, and practically.

Democratization cannot be manifested only in the sphere of the rights of the individual or the production collective, the sphere of the freedom of conscience, speech, or economic freedoms. It inevitably also poses questions about the freedom of peoples and the rights of republics. But if we interpret democracy in a distorted manner as the power of the majority over the minority, it will set traps for restructuring. For this reason, the democratization of such a complex country must provide guarantees that the republics will not be encroached upon by any pseudodemocratic procedure of majority voting. And since we are moving from a state of force to a state of law, we need guarantees that not one union republic will sense itself to be in a position of constant danger with regard to matters of its vital rights to its own land and its own laws. Considering the poorly developed legislation, the inertia of great-power thinking, and other vices of the present union, this will require the immediate formulation of a protective parliamentary mechanism for the states and peoples of the union.

For example, legislative-control functions could be implemented by a chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities created on a parity basis. Moreover, passing a law binding on all the republics would require the consent of each one and the approval and registration of the law by the republic's Supreme Soviet. So far, however, there is no such all-union parliamentary mechanism. Naturally, the more independently minded republics have undertaken to create mechanisms of legal self-defense at home. Thus, the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet on 18 May of this year passed an amendment (one of several) to Article 70 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, which now reads, in particular: "The laws of the USSR and the legal acts of the organs of state authority and administration of the USSR shall be in effect within the territory of the Lithuanian SSR only after being ratified by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and registered in accordance with established procedures" (I am quoting from SOVETSKAYA LITVA). The same thing is emphasized in the Declaration of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, adopted the same day, concerning Lithuania's state sovereignty. I quote: "From now on, from the time the amendment to Article 70 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution is passed, only those laws which have been passed and ratified by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet shall be in force in the Lithuanian SSR." Thinking about how to avoid unnecessary political tensions and collisions with the obsolete Brezhnevian All-Union Constitution, we propose to the congress to introduce an amendment to Article 74 of the present USSR Constitution, so that it reads in full as follows: "The laws of the USSR shall be in force within the territories of the union republics after they are passed and registered by the union republic's supreme soviet." (Applause). I take this

opportunity to submit this proposal, in the form of a legislative initiative, to the congress from the group of deputies from Lithuania.

The democratization of the country must also provide for the defense of the process of democratization. In connection with this, I would like to mention the appeal to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which was adopted in Tallinn on 14 May of this year by the Baltic Assembly of People's Fronts—which included the Lithuanian Sajudis—concerning the threat of war by the state against its own people. This appeal should be read separately and distributed as a document of the congress calling for defining the function of the Armed Forces as exclusively defensive, to be used only in the event of an attack from without. These provisions also form part of a more detailed appeal to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, signed by 50 deputies from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. As a legislative initiative, it calls for adopting a decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet which also includes a paragraph about disbanding the military units which took part in the murders and violence against the civilian population in Tbilisi, as having dishonored themselves. (Noise in the hall).

From these documents you can see that our hopes and concerns affect everyone. We desire that no gas weapons be tested on people, especially in peacetime. And the congress, which today is responsible for the fate of democracy, must deprive any possible "Napoleonic" or "Pinochetian" coup of any semblance of legality. We are talking about the formal right of the internal affairs minister to decide on his own whether to use special forces, and the right of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to declare a state of emergency over the territory of the whole country all at once—that is, for example, to take Mikhail Sergeyevich prisoner and openly declare itself the ruling junta.

Do we really consent to confer such extraordinary powers on them without any kind of people's control? Do you really consent to the presence on your doorstep of a specter with a bad Constitution in one hand and a bloody shovel in the other—do you consent to that kind of power of the law? (Noise in the hall). Lithuania, at any rate, does not so consent. Please accept these remarks as a proposal to the congress and to each deputy personally to take thought, to return to the discussion, and again put to the vote the question of rescinding these decrees as well as the latest addenda to the criminal legislation, especially the passage on state crimes. We also need to think about what we have done and what position we have taken. Recently, Deputy Rodionov was pining for 1937, and many deputies clapped their hands in agreement. Think, comrade deputies, what you were applauding.

And we are all affected by such a dark and bloody stain on the history of the USSR as the Stalin-Hitler pact, concerning which a serious discussion has already been started here. The existence of the secret protocols is proved not only by the Nuremberg copies but also by the

scrupulous compliance with those secret protocols in 1939-1941. Mikhail Sergeyevich himself, in my opinion, does not doubt that they did exist. And I propose defining the task of the commission by something like this designation: "On the pact and the problem of the secret protocols." The purpose of the commission is spelled out clearly in the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet's appeal to us: "Condemn the aforementioned secret deals signed by the Soviet government of that time, and declare them to be illegal and not in force from the moment they were signed." There is no doubt that this will be done, but it is better for all of us not to stretch this ambiguous rubber band.

Which way should we be looking today, in what direction? Restructuring also entails restoring the true meaning to words. Union [soyuz] does not mean "absorption" [priyuz] nor yet "subordination" [podyuz]; a union is an association of union members who have joined together—not by force but voluntarily—for the sake of common goals on the basis of consent and benefits. The journey to such a union is not a short one, but it can be made. It can be done thanks to restructuring, by helping restructuring.

New concepts are needed, concepts which incorporate the best of the Lenin legacy and nothing from the Stalin legacy. Let us envision a union of states and a union of fatherlands. If the spiritual rebirth of the nation gains in strength and produces a material result, it will again take the form of fatherlands, including Russia—the form of self-governing people's states growing out of the principle of people's sovereignty, inseminated by the will of the people, who are masters of their own lives. And then it will be up to them—the peoples and states—as to what reciprocal agreements and alliances to conclude. Such a concept is capable of encompassing whole regions, whether in eastern or northern Europe, joining them together and opening up more realistic prospects for the celebrated European homeland—and who knows, perhaps even building a road to the spiritual rapprochement of Europe and Asia, Christianity and Islam.

Of course, the European homeland would then appear not in the form of a hostel under the authority of an all-knowing and all-suspicious commandant, but rather in the form of a peace-loving community where no one is afraid of anyone, where people can simply share their labor, their goods, their help, and their songs of good-neighborliness. I thank you. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Esteemed comrade deputies! Seven deputies have spoken at the evening session. Two more are scheduled, but we need to decide several organizational matters. It is proposed, therefore, that the discussion be discontinued at this point. Any other proposals?

Voices from the floor: No.

B.Ye. Paton: Thank you. The floor is turned over to Deputy Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies! The Supreme Soviet Presidium and the congress Presidium have directed me to acquaint you with a number of documents. The fact is that you have heard here a number of speeches which included mention of the responsibility of our country's highest levels for what happened in Georgia. There was a hint of just that in the recent speech. A letter has also arrived from public figures in the Georgian SSR, addressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, asking him to meet with them on these very matters.

M.S. Gorbachev: I will do so.

A.I. Lukyanov: I would not like to comment in detail here on these documents; I only want to read them so you may get an objective picture of what took place during those days. The only thing that I will recount in brief is about two telegrams sent from the Georgian SSR by the first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee at 1100 on 26 November and at 1900 on 26 November, when the well-known events took place in Georgia in connection with the discussion of the draft amendments to the USSR Constitution. Mikhail Sergeyevich has told about them here. These are the two documents; they conclude with words to the effect that Georgia's public, party, and soviet organs had not managed to normalize the situation, that it was heating up and becoming increasingly unmanageable and out of control, and that the only possibility of stabilizing things and preventing serious conflicts and excesses was to institute a curfew, at least in the republic's capital city. The second document is the same, except that it is dated 19:50 on the 26th: "On the whole, the situation in the capital city has deteriorated during the past 24 hours, and we again insist on instituting a curfew."

From the floor: Who signed it? (Noise in the hall).

A.I. Lukyanov: They were signed by Georgian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary Patiashvili. That was in November. After that, as you know, Mikhail Sergeyevich addressed an oral message to the Georgian intelligentsia. The negotiations went on all night, and the tension was finally eased. So the first appeals were of just that kind. I will not read all the telegrams here. But I do want the congress delegates to know the three latest telegrams in full.

The first telegram, dated 7 April—please note, 7 April, 2040. It reads as follows: "The situation in the republic has badly deteriorated recently. It is practically out of control. The cause of it was a rally on 18 March in the village of Lykhny, Abkhazian Autonomous SSR [ASSR], which raised the issue of the autonomous republic's secession from the Georgian SSR. But the events have gone beyond those limits. Extremist elements are fanning nationalistic sentiments, calling for strikes and

disobedience to the authorities, organizing disturbances, and discrediting party and soviet organs. Under the circumstances, extraordinary measures need to be taken.

"We deem it immediately essential to institute criminal and administrative proceedings against extremists who are coming out with anti-Soviet, anti-socialist, and anti-party slogans and calls to action. There are legal grounds for this.

"Secondly, we deem it essential to declare a state of emergency and institute curfew in Tbilisi, enlisting additional forces of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and Transcaucasion Military District [ZakVO].

"Thirdly, we deem it essential to implement a complex of political, organizational, and administrative measures, using the forces of the party, soviet, and economic aktiv, to stabilize the situation. It is essential not to allow publications in the all-union or republic mass media which would complicate the situation.

"Dzhumber Patiashvili, secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, 7 April, 2040." That is the original telegram.

The next day, 8 April, 2050. Just 6 hours before the tragedy, as you see.

"This is to report that the situation in Tbilisi continues tense. A rally of many thousands of people is taking place in front of Government House, and their slogans are the same as before: secession from the USSR, creation of an independent Georgia, liquidation of the autonomies, and so on.

"A rally by 3,500 people of Georgian nationality was held in the Abkhazian ASSR, directed against Abkhazia's separation from the Georgian SSR.

"In a number of VUZes, some of the students have declared a hunger strike in support of the rally participants. On the whole, the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, the government, and local party and soviet organs are in command of the situation and are taking the necessary measures to stabilize it. Yesterday, 7 April, the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Buro met, and today the republic's party aktiv met and endorsed the measures taken by party, soviet, and law enforcement organs to step up political, organizational, and upbringing work among the labor collectives and in places of residence; it also adopted an Appeal of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, Supreme Soviet, and Council of Ministers to the republic's communists and working people. In particular, it mapped out plans to hold aktivs in all the regions of the republic, with the participation of Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and Buro members, also meetings of primary party organizations, where practical plans of action have been worked out in pursuit of the measures to be taken.

"A series of television and radio speeches by prominent figures in the sciences and culture of the republic and representatives of the working class and the peasantry has been organized. The VUZes are holding round tables and meetings with young people on topical questions of Georgia's social life, the harmfulness of illegal actions, measures of responsibility for anything committed, and the necessity of strengthening order and discipline in order to further develop democracy and glasnost. After the aktiv, everyone went out to the localities, into the labor collectives, to explain the materials of the aktiv, the party's policies under present conditions, the unity of the party and the people, and the implementation of the tasks of restructuring. Workers' squads were formed in 111 enterprises and institutions of Tbilisi, numbering 4684 persons, to maintain discipline and organization. Concrete plans have been drawn up and are being implemented in collaboration with the MVD and ZakVO to enforce law and order and, if necessary, to take exhaustive measures to prevent rioting and illegal actions. The entire apparatus of the Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, and the Tbilisi Gorkom [city party committee] and Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] is carrying out its functions meticulously and doing active work among the population and the rally participants. At present no measures on the part of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR government, additional to those already taken, are necessary.

"This report is by way of information. Dzhumber Patiashvili.

"Dated 8 April, 2050."

So there was no necessity—I make no comment here—of taking any action from the Center after that telegram.

Now the final telegram that I want to acquaint you with.

The 9th of April, 1025. Now the events have taken place. This is why members of the Politburo, Mikhail Sergeyevich, and now I myself have had to do this, to name the time—1025. This is the telegram. I'll read it: "CPSU Central Committee. On the night of 8 April 1989, in Tbilisi, after 2100, despite all the measures taken by party, soviet, and law enforcement organs, the situation at the rally in front of Government House, participated in by about 15,000 persons, also in other parts of the city, began to be heated up to the limit by extremists and got out of control. In addition to anti-Soviet, anti-socialist, and anti-Russian slogans they began to hand out the extremists' calls for physical reprisals against communists, republic leaders, and members of their families. The rally participants, among whom there were many drunks and persons using narcotics, called for organizing a strike of the entire population of the republic, civil disobedience, and reprisals against those who did not support them. They began to delegate groups of extremists and other participants in the rally to nearby cities and rayons of the republic. In

the city of Rustavi there was an attempt to seize the metallurgy plant. The leaders of the so-called national-liberation movement began to announce plans to seize power in the republic.

"In this situation, in order to ensure public safety and prevent unforeseeable consequences, the decision was made at 0400 to use force to clear the rally participants from the square in front of Government House. In accordance with the plan that had been drawn up beforehand by competent organs, subunits of the republic's MVD and ZakVO were used. As they approached the site of the rally, its participants (they numbered about 8,000 by this time) were frequently appealed to by the republic's leaders, members of the Communist Party Central Committee, the party and soviet aktiv, and Georgian Catholicos Ilya II to halt the rally and disperse peaceably. The rally participants, however, did not respond. In turn, the organizers of the rally inflamed people's passions to the point of psychosis, calling upon them not to spare their own blood and life in resisting the forces of law and order. Subunits of the MVD and troops of ZakVO did not use firearms or cold weapons. They followed instructions strictly with regard to careful treatment of women and adolescents. As the first ranks of the rally participants were driven back, despite the ferocious resistance of extremists using sticks and stones, the crowd became unmanageable and moved toward the young people who had declared a hunger strike and were lying on the sidewalk. Moreover, there were many provocateurs in the crowd who were using cold weapons. As a result of the crush that developed, 16 persons died: 13 young women and 3 men. More than 100 persons received wounds of varying degrees of severity, including 22 military personnel, 13 of whom are hospitalized. Persons who were hurt have been given emergency medical aid. At present, the square in front of Government House has been cleared of rally participants and is under guard by the troops. Necessary measures are being taken to apprehend and arrest anyone who instigates disturbances and to prevent any new rallies or demonstrations. In connection with the tragic consequences of the measures that were taken, a government commission has been formed, headed by Georgian SSR Council of Ministers Chairman Chkheidze.

"Today the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum is to examine the situation and determine the measures stemming from it. To prevent mass disorders and to stabilize the situation we request permission to institute curfew in Tbilisi starting today.

"9 April, 1025. Georgian Communist Party Secretary Patiashvili." Original copy.

I do not want to comment. We knew how the Georgian people, the Georgian population might react to such things after that. Comrades Shevardnadze and Razumovskiy flew there immediately.

M.S. Gorbachev: Why I think we are on the right track by creating the commission. This whole mechanism must be broken down by hours and summarized. The comrades from Georgia have appealed to me.... When I was meeting with the Moscow group of deputies they asked me the first question. Who gave the command? These are the events, this is how they developed. The fact that there was no confidence there was obvious. It was obvious that the situation there was tense, not a promenade as someone here tried to tell us. A promenade, a street festival—it was just not so. Or at the time it was all wrong, understand? Look at these telegrams.

In short, we must get to the bottom of everything, and therefore we have acted correctly in presenting them at this point, so that, taking account of the information, the people will not have a sour aftertaste and the impression that something is being covered up here. No, we really are counting on getting to the bottom of these events. Everything must be clarified, reported to the Supreme Soviet, and a determination made as to what decisions to make in this case. That will be the right thing, in my opinion.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrades, in accordance with the customary time limit the speakers will be given up to three minutes.

F.V. Dovlatyan, artistic director of Armenfilm Studio, city of Yerevan (Yerevan-Mashtots National-Territorial Election District, Armenian SSR): Esteemed deputies! Honored President! I understand that in this difficult struggle for the Constitution, for a just Constitution, in this struggle for power—comprehensible to us or not—our bleeding wounds, of course, give us no peace, and I ask you to give me one minute to express myself. Hear my protest to the secretariat and the presidium. For four days now the Armenian deputies' group has made appeals, demands, and so on and so forth, but we have not received any answer. I consider this to be unjust. We want to know, at long last, why you are not responding to our requests. They are very serious, urgent, and extremely anxious ones. I remind you that our first request was to classify the events in Sumgait as genocide. The second request dealt with Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], the referendum in NKAO. We have simply not been able to get, to receive an answer. Why has there been no response to our requests?

B.Ye. Paton: Comrades! It is proposed that the presidium be instructed to respond to the requests tomorrow. Let us examine another organizational matter.

Comrades! On 25 May, the congress directed the Mandate Commission to give a ruling on Deputy Alksnis's request. The floor is turned over to Deputy Boris Veniaminovich Gidasov, chairman of the Mandate Commission.

B.V. Gidasov, general director of GIPKh Scientific-Production Association, chairman of the board of the Tekhnokhim Inter-Sectorial State Association, city of

Leningrad (Petrograd Territorial District, Leningrad): Esteemed Chairman, esteemed deputies! A brief report on the activities of the Mandate Commission. In the last few days, the congress Presidium and the Mandate Commission have continued to receive direct appeals, letters, and telegrams, the number of which now approaches 100. The spectrum of regions and oblasts of the Soviet Union is broad; letters are coming in from Moscow, Smolensk, Tbilisi, NKAO, Leningrad, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Naberezhnyye Chelny, and other cities and regions. All of these letters can be divided into two approximately equal groups.

In the letters of the first group, the voters complain of violations of the Law and procedures of the Law on Elections (mainly, Article 13). We have generalized these letters, analyzed them, sent them to the Central Electoral Commission, and are continuing to send them there to be reviewed. Some of them are being reviewed in the presence of the chairmen of the district commissions from the places I have mentioned, who were invited specially to Moscow. Based on the findings of the review of these letters, the Mandate Commission will be able to provide additional information in two or three days.

The second group of letters contains additional information about the elected deputies. There are about 50 such letters. They report negative political, business, and personal qualities of the deputies. A review of these letters is outside the jurisdiction of the Mandate Commission; I am here addressing the voters of the whole Soviet Union. But we are generalizing these letters, analyzing them, and will turn them over to the Supreme Soviet to be used in the work of the Commission, which will prepare a new Law on Elections.

Summarizing what I have said, I must note that, as many deputies here have already said, these letters reflect, as in a drop of water, all the shortcomings of the Law on Elections that is in force today. There is not the slightest doubt that the Law needs to be seriously revised or even repealed.

The second question deals with the specific request that was made orally at the congress by Deputy V.I. Alksnis. Deputy Alksnis has raised a fair question concerning deviations from Article 17 of the Law on Elections. This article deals with the formation of national-territorial election districts. Having heard the report of Vladimir Pavlovich Orlov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, and Anatoliy Valeryanovich Gorbunov, chairman of the presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Mandate Commission notes that such deviations did indeed take place. At the meeting of the Mandate Commission, accordingly, instances of the formation of national-territorial election districts with unequal numbers of voters were cited in the territories of other union republics as well. I have a whole list and, if necessary, I can submit additional examples in regard to this matter.

As for the matter being discussed—violations and deviations from the norm of the law concerning equal numbers of voters in the national-territorial election districts—in fact, as the examination has shown, the number of voters in the national-territorial election districts of the Latvian SSR ranges from 28,800 to 127,300. I must caution at this point that the Mandate Commission cannot examine the totality of the election districts. We review the mandate of each deputy individually. Every deputy from the Latvian SSR has been elected in accordance with the law. The Mandate Commission confirms that the mandates held by the deputies present in this hall are genuine. At the same time, in order to prevent such violations—I am reading here for the sake of accuracy—in order to prevent such violations, the Mandate Commission urges the congress to direct the attention of the Central Electoral Commission and the presidiums of the supreme soviets of the union republics to the necessity of complying strictly with the requirements of the legislation on elections when forming election districts.

And, most important: From now on the Central Electoral Commission must publish lists of election districts with an indication of the number of voters in each district. The Mandate Commission requests that you support our proposal. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies! Are there any questions for Comrade Gidaspov?

From the floor: That's not what we commissioned you to do! Remember, when the declaration and protest came in the proposal was made to look into or create a commission of the congress, but Mikhail Sergeyevich supported and insisted that the Mandate Commission be assigned to look into it. And now you say that you're only looking into the question of credentials [polnomochiya]. You have confirmed the credentials of all the deputies to us all at once. In my opinion, you took the wrong route. What I wonder now is whether you did this deliberately or you simply didn't understand what we wanted you to do.

B.V. Gidaspov: May I respond?

From the floor: The subject was violations, there were violations there, the speaker acknowledges that there were violations, yet he says that the Mandate Commission does not have the right to look into it. But we decided then at the congress to assign the commission to look into it.

B.V. Gidaspov: May I respond to you? I think that the comrade deputy, whose name I did not catch, is a little excited. The fact is that we were directed to respond to Comrade Alksnis's request. The gist of his request dealt with the fact that there were deviations from Article 17 of the Law on Elections of people's deputies of the USSR, and violations of the article having to do with the formation and population of districts in the Latvian SSR. This matter has been examined. The results of the elections give no

grounds for depriving anyone of his mandate. The Mandate Commission has confirmed this. Comrade Alksnis was present at the meeting of the Mandate Commission, and he was satisfied with the decision.

(Noise in the hall).

B.V. Gidaspov: Comrades! I have been asked a question, which I here repeat: "You were given documents having to do with Bryansk, Smolensk, and Kaluga..." and also, as I already mentioned, Tbilisi, Naberezhnyye Chelny, Leningrad, and many other cities. These documents have been reviewed by the Mandate Commission and turned over to the Central Electoral Commission, which is supposed to give us a written statement concerning properly conducted verification, summoning the chairmen of the district commissions when necessary. We have in part already heard them in the Mandate Commission, and we will continue this work.

(Noise in the hall).

B.Ye. Paton: Any questions?

From the hall: No.

B.Ye. Paton: It is proposed, comrades, that we take into consideration the report of the chairman of the Mandate Commission. (Applause). Any objections?

Carried. (To the hall): Just a moment. (Noise in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: You ought to agree on when to leave. (Noise in the hall). (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrades, if you're dissatisfied with what in my opinion was a unanimously adopted proposal, let's take a vote. Wait a minute, there can be separate discussion of the other issue. I put it to a vote. Whoever is in favor of taking into consideration the report of the chairman of the Mandate Commission, please raise your cards. I think it's clear that there is an absolute majority. There is no need to vote. Anyone against?

From the hall: No.

B.Ye. Paton: Thank you. (Applause). Comrade deputies. There is a question, shall we yield the floor?

From the hall: No.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, our work is not done yet, please sit down. The whole congress has voted against giving you the floor. (Noise in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please respect the congress.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, on your instructions the congress presidium has drawn up a proposal on the composition of the commission to investigate materials relating to the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigation group headed by Deputy Gdlyan. Deputy Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov has the floor on this question.

R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee (Leningradskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic): Esteemed comrade deputies! In the course of the preparation of this proposal a number of comrades withdrew. At the same time a total of 30 new candidates were proposed. The congress presidium held consultations with deputies from various union republics and regions, including comrades Telman Khorenovich Gdlyan and Nikolay Veniaminovich Ivanov. All the comrades are agreed that the commission should include deputies from various union republics and regions who have not previously associated themselves in any way with assessments of the work of the investigation group. For this reason it is not expedient for the commission to include either representatives of the former commission, which has played its part, or those deputies who have made various statements on the work of the investigation group.

It is deemed expedient also to refrain from including on the commission workers of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, since this department's work is in question. At the same time we must support the proposal that the commission should be able to involve in its work (in the capacity of experts) consultants and specialists in various spheres. So that is the general principle, and now the composition of the commission:

Chairman of the commission: Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev.

Members of the commission: Vladimir Tychiyevich Adylov, lathe operators' team leader at the Tashkent V.P. Chkalov Aircraft Production Association; Valeriy Grigoryevich Aleksandrin, chairman of Yoshkar-Ola City People's Court, Mari autonomous republic; Aleksandr Ivanovich Baranov, chairman of the "Izhorskiy Zavod" Production Association trade union committee, Leningrad City, Kolpino City; Ilmar Olgertovich Bisher, professor at the P. Stuchka Latvian State University; Egidiyus Vitautovich Bichkauskas, Lithuanian SSR Prosecutor's Office investigator for important cases; Yuriy Vladimirovich Golik, dean of Kemerovo State University Law Faculty; Nikolay Ivanovich Ignatovich, Belorussian SSR Prosecutor's Office investigator for important cases; Konstantin Dmitriyevich Lubenchenko, lecturer at Moscow State University Law Faculty; Vello Paulovich Pokhla, member of the editorial collegium of the "Estonskiy Telefilm" Main Editorial Office, Estonian SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, Tallinn City; Vitaliy Aleksandrovich Semenov, senior scientific staffer at the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of

Technical Mechanics, Dnepropetrovsk City; Igor Viktorovich Sorokin, senior superintendent of criminal investigations at the Kuybyshev Station railroad internal affairs department; Nikolay Alekseyevich Strukov, senior investigator of the Kursk Oblast Prosecutor's Office; Olzhas Omarovich Suleymenov, writer, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Writers' Union Board, Alma-Ata City; Svyatoslav Nikolayevich Fedorov, general director of the "Mikrokhirurgiya Glaza" multisector scientific and technical complex; Viktor Nikolayevich Shorokhov, fitter at the Tula V.M. Ryabikov Machine Building Plant; and Veniamin Aleksandrovich Yarin, operator at the Nizhniy Tagil V.I. Lenin Metallurgical Combine, Sverdlovsk Oblast.

Both on the congress presidium and on the secretariat, we considered this matter very carefully and selected these 17 candidates, and I would ask you to approve this composition.

B.Ye. Paton: Any questions for Rafik Nishanovich? (Disturbance in the auditorium).

B.Ye. Paton: No questions?

Voices from the floor: No.

From the floor: I have a question.

B.Ye. Paton: Go ahead. (Disturbance in the auditorium).

From the floor: We nominated Yakovlev. The Yakutsk delegation proposed Yakovlev. Why was he excluded? (Disturbance in the auditorium).

B.Ye. Paton: Go ahead, please, your question.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

From the floor: Please listen to me, comrade deputies, for a minute. Our delegates agree entirely with the opinion on the selection of this commission. But we think that the working class is equally conscious, and moreover there is not a single Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] representative here. I therefore propose—as was proposed earlier in a note—that Vladimir Norikhin be included—he is a controller, from Vladimir City. He is a deputy from the Komsomol and a principled comrade. I ask your support for our proposal.

R.N. Nishanov: Let me answer the question about Comrade Yakovlev from Yakutia. When we were drawing up the list, Comrade Yakovlev's candidacy was also proposed by Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov. But there were six people on the list. We agreed on the basis of parity that those whom we are investigating cannot form the commission themselves. Therefore I asked for three people to be chosen. The comrades proposed three names, which I included on the list—it is all very logical.

One last point. All the deputies on this list have good credentials, they are all upright, no one has discredited any of them, they are all conscientious, and I am convinced that they will study any question objectively. (Applause).

From the floor: Let us vote!

N.V. Ivanov, preliminary investigator [sledovatel] for especially important matters, USSR General Procuracy (Leningrad City National-Territorial Election District, RSFSR): So, comrades, just a moment. You have probably noticed a peculiar feature. Namely, a serious question has been presented to us at the end of the day, when everyone is tired, and as if by the way.

The ancient Romans, when they undertook an inquiry, always said that it was necessary to answer the question: Whom does this benefit?

(Noise in the hall). Just a moment, let me speak. We are supposed to have a democracy here, after all. Please notice that two commissions are being created here. Two commissions have been the subject all the time. The commission concerning the events in Tbilisi, and the commission concerning a criminal case of corruption. Whom did it benefit, incidentally, to form one more commission on Tbilisi, although there were two questions there that needed to be answered: Who gave the commands from Moscow? Just a moment, I'll answer. No need to manifest, so to speak, enhanced intellect. (Applause).

From the floor: We can't hear you. (Noise in the hall).

N.V. Ivanov: I hope you have calmed down, comrades.

B.Ye. Paton: It is proposed that the speech be halted or allowed to be completed. Let's take a vote. All those in favor of stopping the speech please raise your hands.

Voices from the floor: Let him speak!

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Ivanov, please formulate your ideas....

N.V. Ivanov: I have done so. Please have the patience to hear me out, comrades. Here we have a third commission being created, and meanwhile the process of wrecking the criminal case is nearing completion. Here sits People's Deputy Sukharev, whose efforts have resulted in the expulsion of 64 investigators of the group. After this, just try and prove to me or anyone else sitting here in the hall that anyone is interested in completing the case. Today while the congress was in session, Osetrov, the former second secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, Orlov, the former vice president of Uzbekistan, along with Smirnov, were released from custody. What for, one wonders? Because a number of goals scheduled for today.... As the saying goes, "Vaska the Cat listens but keeps on eating."

And while we sit here dealing with problems supposedly by democratic means, what will the commission be looking at next? In order for the commission to examine things from the time the decision is made, it must get all the materials, all of them, and not just those which were received by the preceding commission, some kind of stooges. (Noise in the hall). And now about the creation of the commission.

Come on, let's not do it this way. Please, prepare a list, and not just ten minutes before the end of the meeting, so that we can sit down, look at it, and think about who and how. (Noise in the hall). Well I will answer the question, if somebody doesn't shut the microphones off now. Will somebody please say why we need three commissions? The first one is the CPSU Central Committee and Party Control Committee Commission—an illegal one, because the party here is not supposed to interfere in the administration of justice anymore. The second is the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Commission, which has wasted a month and a half of investigation, and meanwhile it is being wrecked. And what for? Because by today the process is completed....

Voice: (Inaudible).

N.V. Ivanov: Wait, don't interfere, please. The process of curtailing the struggle against organized crime is nearing completion; attempts are being made to relieve the Moscow bribe-takers of responsibility. And this is also unequivocal: to leave a stain on the region of Uzbekistan and remove, whitewash the stain on Moscow, because look, the Russian bribe-takers are being released from custody. (Noise in the hall). Wait, comrades. Look, now, five minutes before the end of the congress, some kind of roster is suddenly submitted. What can I say offhand about this or that person? They seem to be decent people. I'm very sorry and, incidentally, all those present will, after a while, be quite ashamed over what took place in this hall. Incidentally, the report has gone on two days; for two days I have had a note on my desk saying that I have to speak. Comrades, these are questions of principle we are dealing with.

We have all digressed from the question of authority, the central question. We've talked about all kinds of things. And, again, in the same way, by way of an aggressively obedient majority, by waving our cards, we are deciding all the subsequent issues. Time will pass and many of those present here will be ashamed about what took place here. And the fact that you won't give me the floor, you keep getting off the subject, and you won't give me the opportunity to state my position fully, please understand, it does not do you credit. For this reason, I will not say any more or present arguments. Decide how you will; time will put everything in its place. But, comrades, if Comrade Gdlyan and I, along with 64 investigators of the group, were removed from our posts during the period of the work, why not think about removing comrades Ligachev and a number of other persons from their posts for the period of the commission's work? Thank you for your attention.

(Applause). V.S. Sherchenko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Kiev City (Kiyevskiy Rural National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Ukrainian SSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! This morning many deputies found notes to this effect at the doors of their hotel rooms: "Comrades, we ask you to support comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov." We regard this as an attempt to put pressure on deputies.

The decision to form a commission was decided at the congress on Saturday. On Sunday, at 1000 hours, the entire body of deputies from the Ukrainian SSR, and there are 262 of us, met almost in full, and we discussed this question. The delegation decided together whom to recommend for the commission. Several candidacies were put forward. The entire delegation settled on Comrade Semenov's candidacy. And we gave him this instruction: Examine everything honorably and conscientiously. Vindicate the innocent, punish the guilty. We have every trust in the deputy whom we recommended for the commission, and we believe that neither Comrade Gdlyan nor Comrade Ivanov has the right to withdraw a deputy who was recommended by an entire delegation. (Applause).

E.Yu. Yusupov, vice president of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, Tashkent City (from the All-Union "Znaniye" Society): An organization in defense of Gdlyan and Ivanov is at work in Moscow. It is operating very efficiently. There is not one deputy who has not received an anonymous letter and message in praise of Gdlyan. Drunken young people are walking around everywhere carrying placards, stopping delegates and claiming that if Gdlyan is vindicated, the Food Program in the country will be resolved. When we asked one of them, why are you campaigning for a man you have probably never set eyes on, he replied: I do not know him, but I have been instructed to do this. This is not honest, I think it is a provocation.

Moreover, comrades, you have doubtless read a lot about the activity of the investigation team in Uzbekistan. The facts you have learned are only the tip of a huge iceberg, and we have not yet studied what lies beneath the surface. Let the commission examine it and tell us everything. And another comment. I am opposed to Roy Medvedev's candidacy as chairman, because he is one of the handful of journalists who are involved in creating the myth of Gdlyan and Ivanov. (Applause).

N.A. Strukov, senior investigator of the Kursk Oblast Prosecutor's Office (Kursk Territorial Electoral Okrug, RSFSR): Comrades, we are talking now about a man's guilt. But you have forgotten the most important thing: In accordance with our Constitution, guilt can only be established by the court (Article 151 of the Constitution). Therefore, in order to discuss the formation of a commission, we must think about making an amendment to

the Constitution on the question of forming a commission. On this basis I, as a specialist, do not refuse to participate in the commission, but I request that its formation be given constitutional backing.

Moving from the general to the particular, I propose that the question of the actions of the investigation group be examined from the viewpoint of the imposition of law and order. The examination of the question should proceed in two dialectically interconnected directions. First, to establish whether the group operated on the basis of the principles of the rule of law, or of lawlessness. After all, in 6 years Gdlyan and the others entangled many officials, up to the level of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in an endless, irresponsible chain of impermissible methods. For the sake of their political career, they are prepared to do anything in the guise of the protection of law and order, spurred on by the journalists' loathsome praise, in the past, of Gdlyan and his deputy, not of all 209 members of their group. Incidentally, a number of them have already expressed their opinion on the matter. Let us not annoy the people with superfluous talk.

Second. The mafia is still the mafia, and if Gdlyan had not wounded the very foundations of its existence, no violations of the rule of law on his part would be under examination now; it would all have remained in the shadows. (Applause). If we are to debunk the Gdlyan phenomenon, let it be only through the court in accordance with the Constitution. Our parliament is not professional in this respect. There are only a very small number of representatives of legal science on the proposed commission.

But we cannot allow the verdicts that were pronounced, and their legality, to be discredited—that is the most important thing. There were millions of rubles, there were givers and receivers of bribes. There were bribers and bribe-takers, and this campaign is, in my view, aimed at distracting public opinion from the problem of the mafia and preventing investigation of the so-called "sharks."

We will only preserve faith in the rule of law by observing the due process of criminal law. Not many people know that criminal proceedings have now been instituted in the case of the Gdlyan group. But neither he nor the general prosecutor is in any hurry to inform the congress of this. I consider it unlawful to conduct a judicial investigation and an unprofessional investigation by people's deputies in parallel. You cannot build the framework of a rule-of-law state on unlawful foundations. Clearly incompetence of this kind is what leads to casualties in Tbilisi and other regions.

The Constitution must not be violated, and therefore only on condition that an amendment to the Constitution is adopted to provide for the creation of a commission, am I prepared to take part in the examination of this question.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrades, one moment. I want to remind you that the proposal to set up a commission was put forward by the deputies themselves. Questions that come under the jurisdiction of the court may arise in the course of the commission's work. Naturally, these will be handed over to the court. I think that is quite clear.

Voice from the floor (the deputy did not introduce himself): Comrades, I did not want to seize the microphone, but in the course of the election campaign, at every meeting the voters asked me the same question: Are Gdlyan and Ivanov right or wrong? This is a very serious question, and should not be settled by the methods appropriate to a collective farm [kolkhoz] meeting. (Applause).

Embezzlement and bribery have reached a large scale in our state. You know this very well, and we have to combat this evil. This evil is eating like rust into the moral foundations of Soviet man. And people want to know the truth. Therefore I ask that this question be approached seriously, without fuss or protestations. And if Comrades Ivanov and Gdlyan want to ask the deputies for help to find justice, once again I say—let us approach this seriously. And if Gdlyan and Ivanov are guilty, they should be punished. But if they turn out to be right, the consequences, comrades, will be unpredictable. There is a mafia at work here. Let us approach it seriously. (Applause).

A.G. Mukhtarov, editor of the republican newspaper KISHLAK KHAKIKATI ("RURAL TRUTH"), Uzbek SSR, Tashkent City (from the USSR Journalists' Union): Interesting things are happening here, comrades. To form one congress commission, a commission of deputies, has taken so many debates, so much fuss, so many votes, and so forth. But why were tens of thousands of innocent people from Uzbekistan arrested and put in prison, where they languished for a year, 2, 3, 5, 6 years? I have a telegram here: A man from Tashkent Oblast has been in prison for 8 years.

Comrades, if Gdlyan and Ivanov are not guilty, they should not be opposed to the formation of a commission. I wholly support the composition of the deputies' commission. I have only one proposal: The commission chairman should be elected from among the commission by those who are part of it. But not Comrade Medvedev. That is my earnest request. We have our reasons for this.

Z.K. Rustamova, member of Syr-Darya Oblast People's Court, Uzbek SSR, Syr-Darya Oblast, Gulistan City (from the USSR trade unions): On the question of the formation of the commission, since the deputies have decided to form one, we must approach it with the utmost seriousness.

I am very well aware that the lawyers—investigators and attorneys—who are present here know very well that in 6 years Gdlyan's group did an enormous amount of work. They were investigating criminal cases in a particularly

complex category, and each criminal case is not just one or two volumes—it is a criminal file of dozens of volumes. In the oblast courts we have received criminal files of 150 volumes. If a commission is set up it will have access to the numerous complaints made against the investigation group. Let us assume it is to study the complaints. But that will mean that it will be necessary to study the actual criminal cases. Yet the deputies nominated to the commission, our Comrade Adylov, for instance, who works in an entirely different sphere, and then a writer, an apparatchik—from what angle will they approach the study of a criminal case? I am an experienced lawyer, but even for me, it would take a very long time. It is necessary to have a thorough knowledge, by heart, of the norms of the criminal procedure code and the norms of the criminal code. You do not simply open the file, take a look, leaf through it, and decide: Here there was a violation, here Comrade Gdlyan did so-and-so, and so forth. No, even with practical experience you simply cannot do that. And even we lawyers often come unstuck, most often precisely when it comes to the norms of criminal procedure legislation. Yet you want to include heaven knows who on the commission. They will not be able to form their own opinion, offer their own conclusions; they will rely on competent comrades, and they themselves will only nod their heads obediently. I do not understand why we need such a commission. If there really are a vast number of complaints of abuses on the part of Gdlyan's group, as many inhabitants of Uzbekistan assert, then in that case I support the previous comrade's proposal that the matter should be investigated not by a deputies' commission, but by a special investigation group. If abuses are found, then criminal proceedings must be brought and the case investigated and handed over to the court. And only the court can determine their guilt. If the court does not establish guilt, the case will be dropped. The results will be reported to the congress. But what can our incompetent commission decide? (Applause).

S.V. Belozertsev, senior teacher at the Karelian State University, Petrozavodsk City (Kalininskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Karelian ASSR): I wish to say a few words. Today I submitted to the secretariat an appeal from 419 inhabitants of Karelia to the effect that Gdlyan and Ivanov should be given space in the newspapers and time on television to justify themselves. Some kind of one-sided game is going on in the newspapers. If you look at it, it is not surprising that those who are defending them—informal groups and other support groups—are trying to support them by some means of their own. Including pamphlets. That is only natural.

And about the commission. Lawyers are indeed needed, but not only lawyer deputies; independent lawyers must be brought in from outside. The secretariat has two telegrams from Petrozavodsk and Murmansk. I hope you will heed them.

A.U. Khusanov, executive secretary of the oblast newspaper KOMMUNA, Fergana City (Ferganskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Uzbek SSR): Esteemed deputies! Esteemed chairman! First the deputies who are defending Gdlyan and Ivanov themselves proposed setting up a commission and investigating everything thoroughly. Now they do not want the commission to work. I wish to say that I approve the proposed composition of the commission. Let this commission investigate, as well as Gdlyan and Ivanov, the case of investigator Galkin, who in the course of 1987 was conducting cases at the Fergana Oblast Prosecutor's Office and in the course of a year unlawfully jailed 20 innocent people.

I wrote an article on this. It was 100 percent confirmed, but this Galkin was not punished in any way. They presented him with flowers and sent him off to Sverdlovsk. In Sverdlovsk he is working as prosecutor, and also, doubtless, working with equal "success."

I request that the commission investigate the case of investigator Galkin.

Yu.A. Levykin, scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Spectroscopy (Podolskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow Oblast): It was said here recently that certain deputies have received anonymous letters calling on them to help Gdlyan. I have received letters from my voters, workers at Podolsk plants. The letters have hundreds of signatures. People demand that this case be objectively examined. I will hand these letters over to the presidium, but now I want to talk about something else.

This is the point. We are now forming our third commission, but we are forgetting the most important things. Namely, the powers of the commission and its standing orders. But this is very important, because these things will determine how effective the commission is. What do I have in mind? Well, even such a simple thing as this—who actually goes to whom: the commission to the official, or the other way round, the official to the commission? And another thing. If someone is summoned and fails to attend the commission session, what will happen to him? What enforcement measures can be applied? And again. The people participating in the commission must be able to obtain access to documents, and I do not rule out secret documents. Here, obviously, conflict situations of some kind could arise. It seems to me that the standing orders and powers of the commission should rank above departmental norms, since they are set by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

And many other questions must be decided before setting up such a commission. Therefore I have a proposal: Before discussing the personnel of the commission, it seems to me, a working party should be set up; after all, we do not yet have experience of the formation and utilization of such groups and commissions. And only after we have defined and approved the powers and standing orders of the commissions' work will it be

possible to set them up. Otherwise the commissions will be simply futile. They will be shown various out-of-date materials, and perhaps they will be favored with interviews by a few of the chiefs. And that is all.

A.A. Sobchak, department chief at the Leningrad State University Law Faculty (Vasileostrovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Leningrad City): Comrade deputies! I have mounted this platform in order to give some explanations, and first of all to express my disagreement with the two colleagues, the judge and the investigator, who have already expressed their attitude to the formation of this commission. Let us be clear about this. We are setting up a parliamentary commission, not a commission to investigate the case of Gdlyan and Ivanov. And they are USSR people's deputies, and we have to decide the question of whether to deprive them of their deputies' immunity or, conversely, to refuse to do so. Therefore we will have to set up a commission in any case.

A second question. What are we creating this commission for? I think the commission must be set up first and foremost to investigate the accusations that Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov made against a number of state and party workers. That should be the purpose of the commission's work, and not to investigate what violations, if any, were committed in the course of the activity of Gdlyan and Ivanov. (Disturbance in the auditorium).

Your attention, please. Only after investigation—this will be quite correct legally—only after investigation of the accusations made by Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov, and depending on the results of that investigation, should the commission investigate the activity of the investigation group itself. And to that end the commission, like any parliamentary commission of investigation, should be invested with the widest powers, the right to study any documents, and the right to summon any official. And from that viewpoint I now propose that we discuss only the proposed composition of the commission. If there are specific objections to specific individuals—let us discuss them. If not—let us approve the commission, and make it possible for it to work. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrades, I would like.... (Disturbance in the auditorium). Please, let me speak, let me speak.... I would like to remind you that provision was made for the possibility of obtaining any documents that the commission demands. And now, please, go ahead.

G.M. Kurochka, chairman of the permanent session of the Komi ASSR Supreme Court (Vorkutinskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Komi ASSR): People have said here that various charming anonymous "documents" have been sent to various people, and that someone is behind Gdlyan. I speak on behalf of the miners of Vorkuta City. In our presidium now, if they look, they will find at least 10 telegrams from Vorkuta alone to the congress and to me, expressing indignation that we cannot form an objective commission and decide the question of the protection of two investigators. If we

are to form a commission, it must include specialists, otherwise people will not understand us. We do not claim to check on how medics carry out operations, we do not investigate teachers. Why should a teacher investigate the work of investigators?

N.A. Kutsenko, jurisconsult at the Kremenchug House Building Combine No 3, Kremenchug City (Poltavskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Ukrainian SSR): This is my proposal. Everyone is tired of the arguing, and it seems to me that there is a simple solution. We should wait a little while for the formation of the Constitutional Oversight Committee at the USSR Supreme Soviet, and hand over in full to this committee the powers to investigate both the events in Tbilisi and the Gdlyan case. That would be according to the Constitution. And it would at the same time be a test of the reliability of the new committee. Otherwise all the ballyhoo will simply continue here.

S.S. Sulakshin, laboratory chief at the Scientific Research Institute of Nuclear Physics, Tomsk City (Tomskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Tomsk Oblast): Emotions have flared up, not only in this auditorium, but countrywide. Do not forget the millions of Soviet citizens who are even more concerned about this question than we are. I think everyone is too tired now to resolve this serious question. Therefore I propose: First—that the question be postponed until tomorrow. Second—that the proposed list be regarded as a working group to prepare the brief for the commission, and third—to grant Gdlyan and Ivanov the right, not to nominate members of the commission, but to reject them. The point is that the whole country should have confidence in this group, so that emotions do not flare up later in the country and so that people do not start saying that once again an unlawful and inadequate commission has been set up. (Applause).

Deputy (did not introduce himself): Comrade deputies! I did not take Deputy Ivanov's speech to mean that he is opposed to the formation of a commission. I do not think he is opposed to it. From his speech, or rather, from the part of his speech we were able to hear, since the rest was interrupted by rude shouting from the left, we understood that he is in favor of a commission, but a commission that should include people whose objectivity and impartiality he does not doubt.

The esteemed Ukrainian delegation spoke just now and said that they discussed and discussed for a long time the person they are proposing for the commission. But how did the others get there? (Disturbance in the auditorium).

Excuse me! For instance, Comrade Aleksandr Ivanovich Baranov, representative of the Leningrad delegation, was not discussed at the group meeting. And I do not know how Comrade Baranov came to be on the commission. You understand, comrades, Ivanov and Gdlyan should, of course, have a right of consent, so that only objective, impartial people get onto the commission. We cannot

hurry this matter now. They should speak, they should be given the right to speak without interruptions or noise and to express doubts, if they exist, on each candidacy. I think that is the right way to resolve the question. (Applause).

From the floor: Comrades! Give me a minute. Ivanov was elected for a national okrug, from Leningrad City. We are receiving many telegrams, telephone calls, and letters asking us to support Gdlyan here. I wish to say that Comrade Sobchak was on the previous list. We did not object to that. But a proposal came in: Since Comrade Ivanov was elected from our okrug, we proposed to add another, alternative candidacy from the trade unions, from the workers. From the workers who supported Comrade Ivanov by electing him deputy from our national-territorial electoral okrug. That is why I support Comrade Baranov's candidacy, and I ask you, too, to support his candidacy.

B.Ye. Paton: Understood. Comrades, let us put the question to the vote, since our congress has every right to form a parliamentary commission, first. Second, provision has been made for the possibility of obtaining the necessary materials to enable the commission to operate. Third, the commission has the right, as necessary, to bring in professionals whom it considers necessary to its work. Consequently there are no infringements of rights here. So it is proposed that a vote be taken. But, as we did yesterday, not to elect the commission chairman, but to give the commission itself the right to elect its own chairman.

M.S. Gorbachev: Has someone withdrawn?

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade Shorokhov has withdrawn, since he considers himself unqualified to work on the commission; he asks that his place be taken by a professional lawyer. "I have no other reason," he writes. I think we can accept this withdrawal.

So, if there are no objections, let us put to the vote the composition of the commission, without preliminary election of the chairman. Those in favor of this proposal, please raise your credentials cards.

B.Ye. Paton [resuming]: Against? Count those against, please.

A.D. Sakharov (from the floor): I was waving, waving my hand. Why has what I proposed yesterday not been discussed? I have two questions.

From the floor: The list was discussed.

From the floor: Comrade chairman! We nominated a lawyer, why was the Orenburg delegation's candidate, Comrade Miroshin, not taken into account? I request that he be included, instead of Shorokhov.

M.S. Gorbachev: What does the comrade have to say?

R.N. Nishanov (from the floor): I can answer that question. Comrade Miroshin—chairman of the Orsk City Rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee], people's deputy—was included on the list submitted to the presidium by Comrade Gdlyan and Comrade Ivanov. Comrade Miroshin does not yet have his legal education; he is studying at the law institute. When I proposed to Deputies Gdlyan and Ivanov that three of the six be selected for the commission, Comrade Miroshin's candidacy was dropped. There is nothing unnatural about that. It is all legitimate.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrades, I say again, first those who are in favor of the proposed composition of the commission voted, and then those who are against. We asked the commission to count those against, since the overwhelming majority, it was plain to see, are in favor.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed comrade deputies! There were 61 votes against.

B.Ye. Paton: Who abstains?

From the floor: I simply have an announcement to make. The Supreme Soviet Presidium cordially invites the Moscow delegation and all those wishing to attend, to assemble in the Malyy Hall. That is what I wanted to say. In the Malyy Hall in the Supreme Soviet Presidium building, by the Spasskaya Tower. Half an hour after the end of the sitting.

B.Ye. Paton: Have the abstentions been counted?

A.G. Kostenyuk: There were 93 abstentions.

B.Ye. Paton: Thank you. So, comrades, the commission is approved by congress.

B.Ye. Paton: At the beginning of the evening session, two deputies asked for the floor for comments [spravka]. Let me remind you that, according to regulations, no more than three minutes are allowed for comments. Allow me to turn the floor over to Deputy Yuriy Borisovich Solovyev from the Designers Union.

(Noise in the hall).

B.Ye. Paton: You decline? In that case, the floor is turned over to Deputy Albert Anatolyevich Likhanov for comments on Deputy A. Ye. Karpov's speech.

A.A. Likhanov, writer, chairman of the board of the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund, Moscow (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund): Comrades, I realize that it is somewhat risky to speak at the end of the day. I have come here unwillingly. But I must respond to the unobjective information that was unfortunately included in the speech by Deputy Anatoliy Yevgenyevich Karpov, whom I respect.

I regret to say that in preparing his speech, his remarks on the Children's Fund, he evidently didn't even look at the newspaper SEMYA—that's our Fund's publication—which regularly prints estimates of our expenditures. Here, then. The funds that have been turned over to us have been spent for: purchasing buses for children's homes, a medical expedition to save children's lives in Uzbekistan, and to break up groups into smaller units in children's homes all over the Soviet Union. Not all of the money has been spent, of course. We are planning some major programs. The materials of one of the programs were published in IZVESTIYA TsK KPSS No 4. If you read them you will know it involves the construction of a large sanatorium for orphaned children in the Crimea—a mini-Artek.

For this reason, I would like to urge all of us to be more considerate, so to speak, when preparing our speeches, and to keep in mind our mutual dignity and honor. Especially when discussing funds. We have nothing to quarrel about; we are not trotters at the race track; we are not in competition with one another. And we have so many problems in our society that there is plenty of work to do.

B.Ye. Paton: Thank you. It is proposed that this information be taken into consideration.

Comrades, allow me to give three short announcements that I have been asked to make.

"People's deputies elected from women's councils and other social organizations are requested to remain immediately after the meeting." This was written by Comrade Pukhova.

The second announcement. "Please make the following announcement: After the meeting, all deputies from the Komsomol and young deputies elected from the districts are requested to assemble for 15 minutes in the hall under the balcony."

The final announcement. "Please announce: People's deputies working in industry, officials of industrial enterprises, and economic scientists are to remain in this hall after the meeting to draw up proposals for the formation of a Committee 'On the Economy and Problems of Industry.'" Signed by Deputy Mironov.

Thank you. At this point, the evening session is declared closed.

The session will start tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

Ninth Session

2 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in the chair.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies! The work of the congress continues. Today the work of the congress is being participated in by 1,965 deputies that have registered. I would like to inform you that a total of more than 300 deputies have spoken at the congress on voting matters [motivy] and various issues, and a considerable number have taken part in the debates [preniya]. We will try to work it so that today, if everything goes as planned, representatives of all the union republics and a large number of the autonomous republics will speak a second time (representatives of all the union republics have already spoken once). And representatives of the various social organizations as well.

On behalf of the presidium, which is in session and has reviewed the list of speakers once more to ensure, as far as possible, proportional opportunity for the republics and segments of the population to speak, it is hereby announced that the following deputies will speak at today's morning session: Moku, Moldavia; Khmura, Krasnodar Kray; Dyusembayev, a mining foreman from Kazakhstan; Amonashvili, Georgia; Aytmatov, Kirghizia; Sergiyenko, Krasnoyarsk Kray; Trudolyubov, Smolensk Oblast non-chernozem region, from the Komsomol; and Platonov, first secretary of the USSR Architects Union.

As at previous sessions, we think that all requests and remarks should be given at the end of the session. Any objections?

From the hall: No.

A.I. Lukyanov: In that case, the floor is turned over to Comrade Moku for a discussion of the basic directions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policies. Comrade Khmura will be next up.

A.A. Moku, chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium (Kotovsk Territorial Election District, Moldavian SSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! We all agree that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies opens a new stage in the development of our country. Its task is to reactivate the potential of people's rule and the interests of restructuring. The congress is an important landmark in the establishment of a state of law, in the effective functioning of the economic system of the country and of each republic.

Today, regional and national problems are especially closely intertwined. The transition to territorial cost-accounting is of fundamental importance. In Moldavia, a concept of the restructuring of the management of the economy and the social sphere, based on principles of self-administration and self-financing, has been drawn up on the basis of multiple-variant studies which take account of drafts of general principles and propositions. By way of practical experiment, the methodological principles of their application are being worked out on the basis of individual rayons. We are coming to see that

this is a rather complex matter. Moreover, public discussion has shown that certain propositions of the draft "General Principles of Restructuring the Management of the Economy and the Social Sphere in the Union Republics on the Basis of Expanding Their Sovereign Rights, Self-Administration, and Self-Financing" cannot be considered indisputable.

Probably some attention should be focused on the proposal to transfer to republic jurisdiction all enterprises of the construction materials industry and some enterprises of agricultural machine building that are not narrowly specialized, and enterprises of household chemicals and biological products. The dictatorship of the all-union departments here gives rise to serious problems, as we have seen in the case of our cement plants. As it happens, we built them and then had them taken away from us, despite our categorical objections.

It is also necessary to expand the rights of the republics with regard to agreeing on the products list of civilian goods produced in enterprises of all-union affiliation located in the respective territories.

It is difficult to convert to territorial cost-accounting without an accurate, balanced system of prices. Fundamental reform in this matter is an essential condition for accomplishing the task. In terms of its potential, the agro-industrial complex in Moldavia is a key sector in the republic's economy. But it is moving backward in terms of finance. There is, for example, a substantial difference between the prices on agricultural goods and prices on the means of production for the agro-industrial complex. This results in a situation where enterprises having nothing to do with the republic's resources, with its natural and climatic potential, are "beneficial" to Moldavia. We are not against having all-union organs retain the right of shaping the strategy of price-formation. At the same time, we need to greatly expand the rights of the union republics in regard to establishing and regulating prices. Not only on goods that are sold in the republic but also on those which are exported outside, if they are relevant to the republic's specialization.

The rights of the republics in regard to the use of credit resources are considerably restricted. We are unequivocal in our position that all credit resources that are formed in the republic should belong to the republic, with the exception of payments to the all-union fund as determined by normatives.

Our opinion is that in revising all-union principles of restructuring, proposals by the republics should be taken account of to the maximum extent. If we want to have a strong state, we must above all have republics that are strong, independent, and economically developed.

Restructuring is also accompanied by complicated, difficult problems of interethnic relations. It is not just today that we have begun to suffer losses in this sphere. The roots are deeper. Thanks to openness, glasnost, we have today a rather more clear idea about them. But that's not enough.

Restructuring necessitates the search for optimal forms of national-state construction. To be sure, this should not merely turn into new campaigns. It cannot progress without precise criteria in deciding such matters as the creation of new national formations for people and ethnic groups who live compactly and do not have other national formations of their own in the country. Nationalities of this sort, for example, include the Gagauzes living in our republic, who are raising the issue of autonomy more and more insistently today.

Much in the regulation of interethnic relations will depend on the effectiveness of the work of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is essential that this soviet not duplicate the Soviet of the Union, as was the case until recently. Naturally, a fundamental role in implementing national policy must be assigned to the supreme organs of power of the USSR and, of course, the republics.

One of the factors which complicate ethnic relations is the ecological situation in the country and its individual regions. One can observe a striving to look elsewhere for the guilty, to remedy the situation at the expense of others. More and more frequently one hears calls for removing dirty technology outside the borders of one's own republic. But where? It is impossible to resolve economic issues—and many others besides—confined to the shell of isolation; many such issues today go beyond even the borders of the country and are becoming international problems.

In this connection, I cannot refrain from touching upon one of the most urgent issues in our republic, where, as is well known, the ecological situation is especially complex. In light of the fate of the River Prut on the border, which is in a deplorable state today, I believe that it will be necessary to work out and adopt a governmental agreement between the two countries not only to save the river itself but also to open it up to the people, by creating well-developed recreation zones, among other things. This is not just a proposal but one of the mandates of my constituents. The people have been waiting for a resolution of this matter for some time.

There are other local problems as well which need to be dealt with on the all-union level. I am talking particularly about conferring official status on the relevant languages. In connection with this I believe that the time has come to secure the rights of the union republics in the sphere of resolving language problems on a constitutional basis. The lack of a unified approach, and substantial differences in the republics' practices, have not been beneficial to interethnic relations and have led to tension.

It is of fundamental importance to strengthen the sovereignty of state authority and reinforce the rule of law. These are two interrelated processes along the path of forming a state of law. Without a modern legal system we will not be able to solve problems and strengthen law and order in the country. The range of social relations in which it is necessary to perfect legal regulation is very

broad. I would like to focus on the regulation of property relations. Practical experience in applying the laws on the state enterprise (association) and the cooperative system has shown that the institution of property has not been promoted to the necessary extent. Its potential has not been utilized adequately to accelerate socioeconomic development. In the context of restructuring, the USSR Constitution's provisions concerning the types and forms of ownership are also clearly inadequate. It does not, for example, take into account all the varieties of ownership, including joint enterprises participated in by Soviet organizations and foreign firms. The legislative basis for the emergence of new forms of ownership has yet to be created. Hence, appropriate changes are needed in the Constitution, the adoption of a law on property in the USSR. It is necessary to bring the entire text of the USSR Constitution into line with the present stage of development.

It is advisable to adopt a program, on the highest levels of state authority, to enhance the political and legal culture of the masses, to strengthen the prognosticative aspects of law-making. On the whole, I believe that the program-goal approach to resolving the country's most urgent problems should be the decisive one in the activities of the congress and the Supreme Soviet, on the basis of presenting alternative programs by various groups of deputies, specialists, and experts.

Another matter: Reform of the political system, naturally, is a task of exceptional complexity which cannot be accomplished, as the saying goes, in one sitting. For this reason, it is essential to perceive the entire scope and character of the work facing us. The basic content of the first stage of the reform, as is well known, is the renovation of the structure of the soviets, the procedures for shaping the activities of the supreme organs of authority, and the electoral system. Reorganization of local authority is another stage of the reform. We must all be concerned to create the material and legal prerequisites to ensure that the soviets do in fact cope with all problems of local life and are reborn as fully empowered organs of people's self-government.

You must agree, however, that the process of preparing an all-union law on local self-government and local economy is clearly lagging. Existing legislation, moreover, has for some time failed to ensure the necessary differentiation of the powers of the local soviets. Considering the vast amount of work ahead, I would like to endorse the proposals voiced in the report to hold the elections of people's deputies, including those to the local soviets of the republics, in the spring of next year.

There is one other problem that requires serious attention: We need to think today about who is going to be working in those soviets. We need to support them on the material plane. Because of low salaries, it is becoming increasingly harder to select qualified cadres for the organs of the soviets, especially local soviets. I think that this problem needs to be resolved on the all-union level,

and the sooner the better. We need fundamentally new approaches to consolidating the legal status of the deputies. It is a matter of substantially widening their rights and securing guarantees that they can carry out their obligations. The recent election campaign brought to light the inadequacy of many forms of the law on elections. All of this must be taken into account when adopting the relevant republic legislation. We cannot today allow restructuring to get bogged down because of unreliable legal security; we cannot allow the democratic potential of the soviets to be less than fully realized.

One final item I would like to speak about—the press. It is performing a major, essential role in restructuring. It seems to me, moreover, that the press is in the vanguard of restructuring. For this we owe it a debt of thanks, for its valor and boldness. At the risk of falling out of favor with the press, however, I will say the following: Recently, many of the central newspapers have been focusing special attention on our republic. Almost all the publications can be characterized by one phrase: "Oh, the things that are going on in Moldavia!" The same old facts migrate from newspaper to newspaper, except with new interpretations. One would like to think that it comes from a desire to help. But whom? Inflamed passions, an agitated population, tension, an explosive situation! It would all be comprehensible if it were not for the sense of a strange consistency, the approval of one aspect and the disapproval of another.

The correspondents get indignant, give advice and instructions. Even in IZVESTIYA's report on the May day demonstration in Kishinev, along with a few portions of disinformation, the correspondent shed an ostentatious tear over the fact that the students were not allowed to parade in a separate column.

And how are we to take an article in SOVetskaya Kultura, which has divided the republic into two? On one side of the "barricades" is the people; on the other, the leadership. Is this supposed to help stabilize the situation, which is indeed complex?

There are those who probably thought, well, here's another leader who hates criticism. But there is criticism and then there is criticism. I am in favor of constructive criticism that can help resolve difficult issues. But I think you will agree that no publication, no author ought to encroach upon the dignity of an individual, a group of people, or a republic, a sovereign republic.

I am not addressing just authors and editorial boards. It is not a mere formality, after all, that every newspaper carries the designation "newspaper of the CPSU Central Committee," "published by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium," "organ of the Komsomol Central Committee," and so on. Is the meaning that resides in these words always observed in practice? I believe that this problem is not an exceptional one. In the near future we will have to discuss and adopt a law on the press. In addition to protecting the rights and interests of the

corps of journalists, we will have to deal with other aspects of the activities of the press under conditions of the establishment of a state of law.

Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Deputy Khmura. Next up will be Comrade Dyusembayev.

V.V. Khmura, chairman of the ispolkom [executive committee], Olginskaya Village Soviet of People's Deputies, Primorsko-Akhtarskiy Rayon, Olginskaya Stanitsa [Cosack village] (Timashevskiy Territorial Election District, Krasnodar Kray): Esteemed chairman of the presidium! Esteemed deputies! I represent on this high rostrum a category of the leaders of the broadest mass organs of people's rule, on whom, as I understand it, the deputies do not hesitate to confer full authority.

I am the chairman of a village soviet ispolkom. Local soviets, as is well known, are always working with people. They know people's concerns and needs better than anyone else. We all listened attentively to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. In it he sketched the present state of our society in a correct and realistic manner. No matter where you turn, we really have many problems today.

The speaker invited us to debate, to search for ways to resolve urgent problems and to eradicate our shortcomings, which we inherited from the past and which we have managed to accumulate during restructuring.

Our constituents expect us to come up with constructive solutions. The congress must make decisions which will enable our people to live and work better, tomorrow and in the years to come.

I share the position of the report and the statements of many speakers who have discussed a number of serious shortcomings we have and proposed concrete ways to do away with them. The essence of our congress, the way I see it, is to rid socialism of the deformations that afflict it.

When I was getting ready for the congress, I had many meetings with my colleagues. We all are concerned about the position of the village and settlement soviets of people's deputies. People who live within the village soviets come to us with all their needs. But the soviets today have no rights; they are in the position of poor relations; frankly, they perform the role of supplicants to the leaders (and now the labor collective councils have been added as well). I believe this situation needs to be ended, and as soon as possible. Legislative action needs to be taken to resolve the question of the status of the village soviet and its economic relations with all enterprises. It will not be hard to resolve this matter if we talk seriously about turning our policies around to human beings.

Every enterprise ought to make a contribution for each worker on the basis of a normative determined by the soviet. This should constitute the basis of the village budget. Then the village soviet would be concerned to ensure that all enterprises worked as effectively as possible, and all workers living within the soviet's territory would be interested in improving the work of the enterprises. We have already come to terms on such contributions, on a democratic basis: 200 rubles per worker. This has enabled us in part to enhance the authority of the village soviet, and now our constituents have something to come to us for. It is clear, however, that the amount is too small. It does not enable us to cope with the village's social problems, meet the needs and requirements of its inhabitants, especially young people and the aged.

But this has been a guerrilla action on our part, and it needs to be legalized. This is especially important in the Kuban region. Every day, the enterprises of various ministries transport hundreds of thousands of people from the stanitsas to the plants and construction projects of the cities, on the so-called rotation method [vakhrovyy metod]. They're transporting them to Tyumen, Urengoy, and other cities of Siberia and the North.

I heartily endorse the agrarian deputies who day before yesterday raised before the congress the issue that people in the villages ought to be provided for at least as well as and perhaps even better than people in the cities. After all, besides working on the social-sector farms the peasants have to engage in individual farming as well. It is a disgrace when village inhabitants have to go to the city for groceries. It does not benefit the city either.

In our kray we are currently working to ensure that all the rayons and stanitsas are self-sufficient in food. We are actively developing individual household farming [podvorye]; we are setting up procurement and industrial trade organizations [zagotpromtorgi] in every stanitsa, which purchase surplus products produced by the population on household plots, process the goods right there, and sell them to the population. There are now more than 400 such zagotpromtorgi in the kray. By the end of the year they will be functioning in every stanitsa. But the problem of feeds and pastures is a tough one, and for this reason it is necessary to pass a law on land use. The land should be at the disposal of the village soviet, which should have the discretionary ability to provide the population with hayfields, pastures, and all the feeds they need, regardless of the mood or desires of any kolkhoz chairman or other leader. This approach will provide the country with more foodstuffs and enable village inhabitants to live more interesting and meaningful lives.

Comrade deputies, I don't know if any of you have gone into a village soviet building lately; if so, it probably gave you an unpleasant impression.

The buildings are old, shabby, and adapted for other purposes. No one provides furniture for the facilities; they are equipped very poorly; most chairmen have no

transportation, or if they do it is a LuAZ or Moskvich that has been "beaten to pieces." Yet, as the saying goes, people are judged by their appearance. Let us think about ensuring that the appearance of the village soviet is consistent with the local authority conferred upon it.

For example, a decision was made concerning the salary fund for the apparatus of state administration, formed with savings from the wage fund. It would be interesting to ask the author of this document what I'm supposed to do to raise my workers' wages. Am I supposed to dismiss two or three workers, form this savings fund, and then raise wages? That's nonsense.

Comrade deputies, the ecology problem was mentioned in the pre-election program of practically every deputy. For the Kuban, this problem has two sides. One is irrigation on large areas, irrigation without drainage—and that's the trouble. Roads are being built without drainage holes [propusknyye prokoly]. Over many decades, starting before the revolution, more than 2,500 levees and dams have been built on the rivers of the steppes. As a result, the rivers have silted up and are overgrown with reeds. Heavy equipment has compacted the chernozem to a depth of about one meter. And now the soil no longer works on the permeation principle.

Increasing cultivated lands to an impossible degree and sowing skimpy tracts of perennial grasses have disrupted the structure of the chernozem. Money has been invested in the land on the principle of "give it to the one who dug the hole and refuse it to the one who has to fill it in." At present, about 400,000 hectares of Kuban chernozem land needs to be saved from inundation. Hundreds of stanitsas are flooded. A long-range drainage program is needed. Equipment is needed. Construction materials are needed. We develop the non-chernozem zone, and the Kuban chernozem lands are being inundated. Is that good management? The kraykom and krayispolkom have collaborated with scientific institutions to prepare a program to save the cultivated land and stanitsas. We are very fearful that the program will get lost in the offices of the now-liquidated agro-industrial committee. All of the fields in the territory of the Olginskaya Village Soviet, Primorsko-Akhtarskiy Rayon, are flooded, cellars are full of water, and every yard is flooded. In Timashevskiy and Bryukhovetskiy rayons—that's my election district—there are kolkhozes where half the cultivated land is under water. The new Council of Ministers has got to take a very serious look at this problem.

The other side of the problem is the rise in the number of industrial enterprises in the Kuban. Land is being taken out of cultivation for their construction. Although treatment facilities are being built, they are not being built well. As a result, industrial wastes are poisoning valuable species of fish and polluting the waters. Added to this are the chemicals used to protect vegetation, which we have

not yet learned to deal with and lack the proper equipment—we apply them using home-made equipment, without laboratory analysis, by guesswork. You can imagine the situation today and what it will be like tomorrow.

There are real paradoxes at work here. Kolkhoz craftsmen have developed equipment that makes it possible to grow rice without herbicides, but the state does not want to pay for it as a net product; it will only pay for the allotted quota [otvedennaya kvota]. These inventions should be made use of and rewarded, but people turn their backs on them. This seems to translate as: Don't raise a good-quality product. The kolkhozes of the Kuban do not have shops for processing vegetables and fruit, packing materials, and storage facilities, yet every farm ought to have these items. This would boost production output by 25-30 percent just by eliminating losses, quite aside from assortment and quality concerns.

We ought to think about what we are leaving our posterity, for the Kuban is not only a breadbasket but also a sanatorium. Every year, about 15 million people come there from all parts of the country to recover their health and take a vacation, but because of all the smog, chemicals, and barbarous felling of the forests they not only fail to recover their health, but also their diseases get worse. The Kuban ought to remain the country's breadbasket and sanatorium. It is essential to protect our mineral springs and develop a healthy environment.

Comrades! I avail myself of this rostrum to call upon all deputies to work to protect the country's fish resources. We have already exploited them to the point that all kinds of valuable species of fish are now missing from our waters. We live next to the sea and can observe how many fish are floating belly-up, have gone blind, and are asphyxiated. Taken altogether, it has hurt fish stocks. Compared with the 1950's, the number of fish in the Azov Sea has been reduced to one thirty-sixth. We are keeping water levels 1.5 to 2 meters above normal, which to a large extent causes flooding and reduces the flow of fresh water into the sea. For this reason, we will have to refrain from building livestock complexes in the coastal zone and near rivers and other bodies of water; we will have to cut down on amounts of chemical treatment. All the people must condemn the mistakes that have been made in environmental use and allocate as many funds as necessary to repair the damage and implement environmental protection.

We, the people's elected deputies, must use all our powers to resolve the key problems of the villages: the construction of public facilities and, in particular, the development of sources of fuel supply, gas pipelines, and the construction of rural roads. Efforts to solve the rural housing problem must be constantly monitored, and loans must be made available. Comrades, a decision has been made concerning this, but there are no funds, and there are long lines of people waiting for loans for private construction. Special attention must be focused on the

revival of khutors [hamlets] and auls [mountain villages]—that is, on building well-appointed housing with all the conveniences, including the building of roads and installation of gas. Unless we do this today, there will be no one to work in the villages tomorrow. Let me cite an example from my own soviet. In recent years, more than 2500 persons have left the stanitsa, and there's no one to do the work. But the country needs to be fed. Who's going to do it? For this reason, I propose some kind of revision of allocations. A substantial portion should be given to the villages. The congress ought at least to make a start on overcoming the differences between the city and the village—not by words but deeds—and examine the question of retirement security, especially for kolkhoz members, who constitute that category of people who worked for a pittance, carried the burden of the war on their shoulders, and are now receiving pensions of no more than 50 rubles.

Many speakers have asked where the funds are coming from, where we can economize. That is the business of government rather than scientists. Let them think and act, although there have already been many proposals. It seems to me, however, that we at the congress need to determine what needs to be addressed first of all and channel all funds there. There will be results: the people will believe in restructuring.

Comrades, the authority of the party, as the initiator of restructuring, is rising. At present anyone who feels like it attacks the party and its cadres and the Politburo, often for no reason. Because they carried the most difficult problems on their shoulders, raised the people up, and built the country on raw enthusiasm? The party should not be attacked but rather thanked, both for what it has done and for its present course of restructuring. Let's think about it, take a look around. There is no other power in the country that can take the place of the party. The crybabies can neither build the country up nor feed the people, I'm sure of that. (Applause). And you, comrade communist-deputies, also ought to think about that, unless your party conscience has gone to sleep.

Another matter: Our kray has a population made up of 101 nationalities. We live and work in multinational collectives, and we have nothing to quarrel about in the Kuban. What problems we can solve, we do. It is necessary to raise the status of the autonomous oblasts, but there is a problem which the state must solve. That is the problem of the Crimean Tatars. It exists, and we cannot stand aloof from it. The sooner we solve it the better. I say this in the name of all the deputies from the Kuban.

A final matter. Day before yesterday, the deputy from Sochi addressed our esteemed Chingiz Aytmatov in a disrespectful and tactless manner. We of the Kuban group of deputies extend to you our apologies, esteemed Comrade Aytmatov. Be assured that we do not think that of you. (Applause). And we apologize for the sad mistake of our colleague. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Deputy Dyusembayev. Next up will be Deputy Amonashvili.

V.V. Dyusembayev, mine foreman in the drilling and blasting section of the Tishinskiy Mine, Leninogorsk Polymetals Combine, Leninogorsk (Zaysanskiy National-Territorial Election District, Kazakh SSR): Honored chairman, esteemed deputies, and dear esteemed constituents! During these intensive days of the work of the congress, we deputies have had the chance to listen to and compare many points of view. If you assume that the width of the horizon depends on the elevation of the observer, then maybe more problems can be seen from the height of the Moscow academic institutes, and more ways out of the country's difficult economic situation can be seen. But I was more pleased by the proposals of those who stand firmly on the ground—our agricultural people in the person of Starodubtsev, public affairs writer Chernichenko, and writer Belov.

I avail myself of the high rostrum of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to present the viewpoint of those in the depths of the mines who do not have the opportunity to look down upon our everyday problems from on high. I represent the miners, the metallurgists, and the concentration mill workers. The miners are the vanguard of the working class, and I am proud of that. I take this opportunity to focus the attention of the Congress of People's Deputies on how our miners are living and working today. Having worked in the mines for 20 years, I can say that there are no signs of improvement in the miners' working conditions and wages. Conditions are getting worse, and we are having to go ever deeper into the earth. The metal content in the ore is falling, just like the professional prestige of the miners who provide the country with nonferrous and rare metals. We talk of environmental ecology, spiritual ecology, and moral ecology, but we do not talk about human ecology. The man working in the mine today is wearing himself out. Dust levels, gas fumes, poor medical services, occupational diseases, and short lifespans attest that it is essential to take decisive measures immediately to improve the state of affairs in the mining and metallurgy industry.

During the pre-election campaign, problems of environmental ecology were brought to the forefront by every deputy from our oblast. The adoption of a special decree regarding East Kazakhstan Oblast did not solve the problem. The Leninogorsk Polymetals Combine has been producing ore for 70 years. Now, with the transition to cost-accounting and self-financing, the combine's labor collective, like other labor collectives, must confront its own problems one-on-one. But perhaps there are not enough forces in the oblast to correct the situation. In this connection, I believe that the transition to regional cost-accounting definitely needs to be preceded by a reform of prices on raw materials. I believe that the State Committee for Environmental Protection, which is headed by Comrade Morgun, needs to prepare and submit to the Supreme Soviet a register of the cities and regions of our country that are the worst off in terms of

ecology. On the basis of such a register, the USSR Supreme Soviet ought to determine the priority sequence of measures to save the Aral Sea, for example, Lake Baykal, and East Kazakhstan Oblast.

Our constituents want to know why our departments are selling raw materials abroad, why the statistics are silent about the cost of the zinc and lead that are sold, the production of which is based on ecologically harmful technologies—that is, why we get to keep the polluted water, air, and soil in exchange for equipment to mine the ore. I would like every one of our people's deputies to be given statistical collections concerning foreign trade. I now address the scientists of the defense complex: You have developed lunar vehicles that have walked on the moon; how about developing tunneling combines for the mines? Only not for the same price as a lunar vehicle. Because now we are on cost-accounting.

Today we are discussing the question of closing down nuclear power plants, but we have our own problems. In East Kazakhstan Oblast there is the Ulba GES [hydroelectric power station], which was built in accordance with the GOELRO [State Plan for the Electrification of Russia] and is not functioning today. Matters of this sort need to be reviewed, and small GES's like that need to be reactivated.

My pre-election campaign came to an end just before the congress. Probably this is why there have been such vigorous requests not to come back from the congress without decisions guaranteeing the power of the local soviets. To start with, I think that we ought to decide that all above-plan output should remain at the disposal of the collectives and the local soviets. By way of a temporary decision, probably, we ought to set a percentage for contributions to the budget of the local soviets so that they can start right now to build up their own economic base. I want to say something about heavy industry which is producing consumer goods. These consumer goods (around 50 percent of them) should be supplied first to the industry's own region.

Comrades, I cannot refrain from expressing my disquiet over the proposal to sell the land for private use, because I fear that instead of oranges dropping in price to the level of potatoes, miners will have to buy potatoes at the same price as oranges. I must also say something about my attitude toward the idea of buying back enterprises on lease. It's true that there are several billion free rubles around the country, but not in the hands of the workers. Workers today don't have the money to make such purchases, but they do have the power and the organization to prevent the dispersal of the nation's wealth throughout the private apartments of the Mafia and the corrupt cooperative businessmen—that is, those who do have the money. (Applause).

In conclusion, a few words about the party. I myself am a communist who joined the party during the period of restructuring, and I view my victory in the elections as a

testimony to the party's authority. But one gets the impression at the congress that if we added up to less than 80 percent, perhaps some communists (including certain ones holding high posts and party jobs) would cherish the authority and trust of the party more, because I don't think communist voters would empower them to introduce a split in the ranks of the deputies.

Much has been said today about the army, but I personally cannot refrain from stating my opinion as a working man. Indeed it does have its shortcomings, and plenty of them. Indeed it does have its problems. But the army is the child of the people, and one must not betray or fail to love one's child! Why? Because we exist and are alive today only thanks to our army, which has defended us and maintained the peace for over forty years since the war. (Applause).

Knowing the hospitality of the Kazakh people, I take the opportunity to invite you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to visit our East Kazakhstan—because no other national leaders except for Sergey Mironovich Kirov have ever come to see us in Leninogorsk, the forge of nonferrous metallurgy. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Comrade Amonashvili. Next up is Comrade Aytmatov.

Sh.A. Amonashvili, general director of the Experimental Scientific-Production Pedagogical Association of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Public Education, Tbilisi (from the trade unions of the USSR): Esteemed chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet! Esteemed deputies! Yesterday the deputies from Georgia met with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. It was a very open meeting, with frank discussion, where we were able to speak our thoughts and feelings and explain certain phenomena. In turn, Mikhail Sergeyevich also explained a great deal to us. I am confident that the commission which you, the congress, have set up will get to the bottom of everything and render the necessary, correct, the only correct decision. And this truth will be spoken. Everyone needs the truth—you need it, we need it, because in our country, which is being built on the basis of new principles, principles of humanization, the democratization of society, and glasnost—this truth will be a weapon in our hands to fight to save the soul of the people.

Things are very difficult for us now. I will not overdramatize the situation that we have experienced. Perhaps it is not worthwhile now to speak of all the events, but I would like to examine them from the standpoint of the upbringing of the future generation.

First I would like to say that the telegrams that were read here were unknown to us. Most important, I simply want to assure you, dear deputies, that the claim that narcotics addicts and alcoholics were assembled on the square is not in accord with the truth. Perhaps there were some

extremists and others of a different persuasion among the thousands of people who were there, but in the main these were talented young people striving to attain the republic's sovereignty.

I would like to say a couple of words about the state of the schools, which are generating many of our problems and will continue to do so. Our schools have become extremely authoritarian. This is evidently a logical phenomenon, because for many long years authoritarianism itself dominated all over our country. And this authoritarianism was reflected, mirrorlike, in the schools as well. Pressure on the children, the end of freedom, no thinking, no living thoughts. Yet the teacher stands as the main figure, the authoritarian, in front of the children. And, incidentally, this paradox emerges: On the one hand, the teacher is the most frightened person in our country, because he has always had looming over him a very broad network and system consisting of the inspectorate, orders, and decrees. All of this has restricted the teacher's progress toward living thinking. On the other hand, this frightened person frightens his own pupils in class.

We need to divest ourselves of this kind of school situation. And if there is no democratism or glasnost in the schools, if there is no humane approach to the child, the child's personality, we will lose our soul in the schools.

At present we are talking a great deal about the restructuring of the schools, about outfitting the schools with new equipment. It is essential to allocate considerably more funds for education—double the amount, triple, quadruple the amount. But it is essential to be aware, at the same time, that without a good educator, one who knows how to approach people, there will be no upbringing in the schools. And sometimes this good person should be free to sit under a tree with his pupil and there forge his soul.

It is authoritarianism, evidently, that brought about the events that took place in Tbilisi, as well as other places, because a child who has been brought up under such conditions is letting loose his feelings, and this liberty is manifested in various aspects and in various spheres.

There is one other major problem relating to the national schools. We often say that in our schools instruction is conducted in the native language. This is true. This is an achievement of the Revolution, and the national language is becoming the language of instruction for every republic. It must be kept in mind, at the same time, that instruction in the Georgian language, for example, still by no means entails that our school is both a national and a Georgian school. When you consider that all the other content of the instruction is nothing more than a translation from Russian to Georgian.

Consider such a problem as the teaching of history in the schools. Which history do our children study? As far as Georgia is concerned, what we mainly study is the history of the USSR. And what does this history entail? Our Georgian children know more about events in Russia and about what took place from ancient times to the present than about events and phenomena in Georgia itself. And the history of Georgia is barely squeezed into the syllabi; it was even forbidden to allocate more hours to this subject. It seems to me that every republic has its own vast culture and extensive past. That is one of the achievements of our Union. For this reason, it is on these principles that we ought to structure not only history, not only literature, but also, probably, all the other subjects. Standardization [odnotipnost] of our schools is destroying them: standardized curricula, standardized texts, standardized teacher training—everything standardized, and in the end what we get is a person who is also, as a form, molded in the spirit of standardized thinking. So now that freedom is granted, we are surprised when a person acts in a way that is perhaps less than fully restrained.

National sentiments are like delicate heartstrings in a person, very delicate heartstrings that must be approached very carefully. I know that my remarks now are being heard in Tbilisi, and various events are taking place there. For that reason, I would like people in Tbilisi also to know what I am telling you now. The article in the newspaper, to which General Rodionov referred, was written during the time of the curfew. I beg you please not to think that events took place the way they are portrayed in the newspaper. A commission has been set up. It is this commission which will ascertain the whole picture, everything that took place there.

I would also like to say the following. Under present conditions, I may say courageous conditions of restructuring, many complex problems have come to light in relations. And you will probably agree with me when I say that our Union must hold together in the future not on the basis of force but on the basis of spiritual community, friendship. If this friendship is infringed upon in any way, very serious complications could develop between us, and that would lead to no good.

Hence my appeal to the deputies—forgive me, please, for being so bold as to say this—let those who come to speak on this rostrum be extremely careful, let them weigh every word that has to do with nationality. I have received many telegrams these days—from Armenia, from Azerbaijan, and from Georgia. They include many lines like these: It is necessary to weigh every word so as not to hurt the profound structure that is of such concern to people. (Applause).

In conclusion: Perhaps what I am about to say will not be supported, but I would certainly like it to be. We have a multinational country, but there are basic languages in our country—let's say, the languages in which our republics live, speak, and work. It would probably not be a bad

idea if the congress were to work in these different languages. Let the Azerbaijani, Armenian, Georgian, Latvian, and other languages be heard from time to time from this rostrum. We must let our ears become accustomed to the sound of the national languages. That would do no harm to our relations. (Applause).

And so, in order that this be done for the first time today, allow me to say a couple of words in Georgian. They will be addressed to our young people in Tbilisi. Would you also please listen to the sound. I assure you I will say nothing that might split us apart or destroy our community, our love. Dear comrades, I want you to know that Georgia has never drawn nourishment from nationalism, and it will never do so. (Applause). It is said that during the Tbilisi events there were anti-Russian statements; it is claimed that there were calls for secession, and so on. It may be that there were a few such calls, but they do not reflect the Georgian soul, which is free and strives for friendship. If you come to see us, our hospitality will certainly take you into its embrace. Perhaps I offend our government, but let me say that there will be both wine and vodka on the table. (Applause). These are the Georgian words which I address to my fellow countrymen.

(The orator speaks in Georgian).

[Begin Georgian passage] Dear fellow countrymen, young people! I address every one of you in the name of the deputies from Georgia. The congress has taken our problems to its heart and created a commission which will determine the truth. Yesterday we met with Mikhail Gorbachev, who believes that everyone who is guilty must be punished severely. I beg you to remain calm and show patience. Let all of us, young people and the older generation alike, work together, joining forces to build Georgia's future and together contemplate Georgia's sovereignty. [end of Georgian passage]

Dear fellow countrymen, young people! I address every one of you in the name of the deputies from Georgia. The congress is taking our problems to heart. A commission has been created to determine the truth. Yesterday we met with Mikhail Sergeyevich, who also believes that all of those who are guilty must be punished severely. I beg you to remain calm and show patience. And let us together—the younger and the older generations—join forces to build Georgia's future and its sovereignty. (Author's translation from Georgian to Russian).

Thank you very much for your attention. (Thunderous applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Deputy Aytmatov. Up next will be Comrade Sergiyenko.

Ch. Aytmatov, writer, chairman of the board of the Kirghiz SSR Writers Union, editor-in-chief of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA, Frunze (from the CPSU): There is an expression, "and so we meet." This phrase marks a certain stage in a difficult talk between people. I

would like to use it today in addressing you. And so we meet. Just so, on this building site, where we are erecting together an edifice of new democracy, there is as yet a bit too much of a crush, lack of organization and restraint. Naturally, you endure. All these days, my emotions and pains, and hopes, have never left me; nevertheless (for whatever happens, the work goes forward), the walls are rising, and that's the main thing.

From the first moment of the congress all of us have been concerned about the question of what the forum of people's deputies should be. Can it acquire the unconditional imperative of a supreme organ of independent people's rule, or will it again fall at the feet of a ruling bureaucracy, an obedient and convenient instrument? By now we can state confidently that the congress, overcoming the brambles of skirmishing, polemics, and feuding, and thinking and rethinking its past and present, has in the process of its work taken on the character of a fundamentally new democratic phenomenon in the entire arena of our history, in our self-awareness and in the opinion of the world community.

After dozens of years of people's silence, after dozens of years of abstract promises about the triumph of an abstract communism, after a grave and spiritual enslavement, after ideological and economic totalitarianism, self-deception, and lies, our democratic aspirations are finally coming to be realized in civilized law-making. Although this may only be the beginning, it is already difficult to exaggerate the significance of this phenomenon not only for the fate of the fatherland but also for the entire world as a whole. For we are a part of mankind's mainland, and the extent to which we recover our health, the extent to which we are truly able to find ways to get out of our difficult economic crisis, the extent to which we are engrossed in constructive actions to build a state of law and secure individual liberty, the extent to which we succeed in settling interethnic relations, the extent to which we are able to integrate ourselves harmoniously in the living, interactive structure of the world community, the extent to which we are able to develop in ourselves an understanding of the priority of values common to all mankind and free ourselves of the barbaric doctrine of world revolution, the extent to which we become less dogmatic and less aggressive in our judgments and ideological opposition to other worlds—to that extent we will alleviate the lot of modern mankind and, naturally, our own. Everywhere, in all the countries around us, the people are glued to their television sets, feeling and nourishing in their hearts a hope for the better. That's as it should be. We are a great multinational power from which positive impulses and positive experience should proceed, even when we are occupied with purely domestic affairs, even when it comes to the social disasters that have befallen us.

How shall we live in the future? How are we to get out of the situation while the whole world watches? This is on everyone's mind. Allow me to say something about the matter.

The economy. The country lacks a clear economic concept. And that is the stumbling block. A very dangerous situation has gone too far. Against a background of mass dissatisfaction and censure, of course, it is not especially hard to prance about on the horse of criticism and catch the attention of television viewers. In this sense we are all succeeding, except that how, in practice, are we to increase the quantity and improve the quality of the products of labor, by what means are we to achieve this on the scale of a great country? No one knows.

Elated with the spirit of restructuring and glasnost, we are now beginning to see our way clearly on the edge of a gaping material crisis. And if we rightly presume that it is chiefly short-sighted, incompetent leadership and ineffective reform that are to blame for our plight, the inconsistency of restructuring, that is by no means everything. You won't travel very far in a cart without wheels, no matter how much you whip the horses.

The transition from essentially forced labor, from the legacy of barracks socialism which categorically ruled out man's independent initiative, enterprise, and competitiveness as being intolerable from the class standpoint, an unacceptable counteraction against egalitarian, standardized, impersonal policies, could not be otherwise. This legacy itself gave birth to a frightful evil. Its name is universal alienation, the total alienation of everyone from everything: the government from the people, the people from the government. Until very recently, the people were isolated from real politics, and now before our very eyes a breakthrough is taking place, the people themselves are making a massive breakthrough in the contemplation of their place in society. And for this reason, in my opinion, the time has come to contemplate the path of rebirth. How to rid each one of us and society as a whole of the years of entrenched mentality of alienation and the servile attitude of grabbing as much as possible and working as little as possible.

To do this we need to think about the system of society itself, its root properties, its flaws. Life itself suggests that it is time to place on the agenda the necessity of a skillful combination of various forms of ownership, a combination of various forms of production relations under the maximally allowable conditions of socialism. Incidentally, concerning socialism, that holy of holies of our theoretical doctrines: We must not turn the concept of socialism into an icon. We should not pray to socialism; rather, socialism—in an increasingly well-equipped and elaborated form—should serve people in the cause of creation and prosperity. While we conjectured, ordained, and expatiated as to what socialism should or should not be, other peoples have already got it, built it, and are enjoying its fruits... whereas we, with our experience, have done them a good favor, showing how not to build socialism. I have in mind the flourishing, law-governed societies of Sweden, Austria, Finland, Norway, Holland, Spain, and, across the ocean, Canada. I say nothing here about Switzerland, which is a model. The working man in these countries earns an average of four

to five times more than our workers. The social security and level of wellbeing of the working people in those countries are something we can only dream about. That is real and, if you will, workers' trade-union socialism, although these countries do not call themselves socialist, but they are none the worse for that.

How we have tied ourselves down to the immobility of our own socialism! Why does our miner have to declare a hunger strike in order to get them to sell him a car, which in the aforementioned countries is there to be selected, like footwear? Why does our shepherd have to seek an audience with the chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers just to fall on his knees and beg for tires for his old UAZik [vehicle produced by the Ulyanovsk Automotive Plant]?

The essence of socialism does not lie in terminology but in this essence itself. When I said as much once in the editorial offices of one of our major newspapers, the person I was talking to frowned and sadly shook his gray head: "In 1937 you would have been put up against the wall on the spot for saying that." I do not doubt it, especially since I have my own family experience on that account. And now from that dead-end, excuse me, reactionary state of ours the explosion of restructuring has brought us here, to this congress. So let us take thought and decide whether Stalinist socialism can move us forward. No, we are already certain about that. We need to borrow all that is positive, the whole positive experience that is applicable to our own big, specific country, from the advanced, highly developed civilized countries, the experience of states based on law. If we ourselves do not know how, we must learn how others have learned to live and work under real, genuine socialism. And in this connection, comrades, I have two small, concrete proposals.

First, and this is forced upon us but inescapable, we must obtain large credits from the West and reduce the deficit. I know, I know, debts and servitude. But we have vast potential capabilities; we will pay them off and settle accounts in time. Obtain credits before it's too late—that's a priority, emergency measure.

Further: Yesterday we heard a speech and an address on matters of agriculture. It was a universal lament for the countryside. One feels like weeping, especially one who himself sprang from peasant soil. The peasantry needs help from everyone. I propose, by analogy with the possibilities of an alternative choice to military service in the European countries, where a young man, because of his moral objections, commits himself to working off his military obligation in onerous jobs, for example, as a medical orderly in a cancer hospital—if we could permit something similar: Let any draftees who so desire work off their military obligation on the farm. Especially considering that the practice of universal conscription is not our finest feature. (Applause). It seems to me, in any case, that we ought to contemplate this matter.

Right after the economy, the second urgent problem is our national relations. It's good that the commission on Tbilisi has been set up; in any case, a legal guarantee must be worked out to protect the people of our country against violence. On the whole I share the idea of the full-fledged socialist sovereignty of the union republics; without it, federal status becomes a fiction. In my opinion, sovereignty needs to be accomplished methodically, in a well-considered and consistent manner, via statutes rather than emotions; we must not be in a hurry to dot all the i's in one pass. What we have is too precious, and what we want is too serious.

The problems of the national languages are also very close to me, and I would like to dwell on them briefly as well.

It concerns the concept of state languages in the republics and the necessity of providing the legal foundations for this process. Surely, the general model needs to be well considered. I believe that the federal nature of the state should also integrate the federal nature of the country's languages in the sense that the languages of the indigenous peoples of the union republics should function as state languages. In this context, again, it seems to me that we need to maintain a reasonable, logical sequence, and reasonable, convincing, concerted action. In short, the national languages of the republics, which were long ignored locally, must be given most favored linguistic status in order that, being reborn, they may take their rightful place. This is an issue that is very complex, especially in Central Asia. Many of our fellow citizens who are unaccustomed to the presence of the language of the indigenous peoples in official affairs take it to be in opposition to Russian. Let us get clear about this.

The genius of the Russian language has served all of us well, and I personally cannot imagine life without this shared spiritual wealth of ours. In this sense the Russian language is unshakeable and universal. Nothing threatens it within the whole country. But by virtue of its historical spread, it must not crowd out the other languages of the indigenous peoples that exist side by side with it. In this connection, it is essential to realize that every nation remains a nation so long as it has its own language; in this lies its cultural sovereignty. And as soon as it is deprived of the opportunity, for any reason, to use and cultivate its language, it ceases to be what it was and should be.

Hence the task of harmonizing the languages, primarily on the basis of the concept of bilingualism [dvuyazychiye] with priority to most favored status for the languages of the indigenous peoples endowed with official rights. As yet, not all of us are ready to perceive this truth. What is needed is compromise, dialogue, mutual drawing together, and everything must be resolved on the basis of mutual benefits and mutual respect.

Excuse me, could I have another couple of minutes?

A.I. Lukyanov: Shall we give him 2 minutes more?

From the hall: Yes.

Ch. Aytmatov: Unfortunately, the mass media do not always promote this process, especially the Central press. It has become all but fashionable to levy the charge of nationalism and parochialism against any citizen who stands up for his natural national needs and, at the same time, to encourage nihilism and the denial of one's own nation as a nation, to accuse normal, patriotic people of nationalism. These manifestations in the press (whether the authors intend it or not) artificially inflame undesirable, negative sentiments in places where the people have lived peaceably and could peaceably share one another's concerns and problems. When it comes to national questions, the press and television must weigh their words very carefully. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, for example, very seriously wrote that the events in Alma-Ata were almost certainly caused by the fact that many young people still attend separate schools in their native language. How are we to take this, and what can we call it?

Nor can the sovereign rights of a socialist republic be circumvented in Kazakhstan. This republic cannot be made an exception to the rule, because it's not the fault of the Kazakh nation—one of the most ancient ethnoses in that territory—that the country needed grain and it was necessary to relocate many millions of people from the European territories to the Virgin Lands, which had a negative effect on the ratio of the newcomers to the indigenous population. And now, at every opportunity, the indigenous people are stood in the corner and reminded of their place. (Applause).

The law, the Constitution, must safeguard the cultural uniqueness of each nation, considering the fact that the indigenous peoples, of Central Asia, for example, including the Kazakh people, do not have their own ethnic analogs outside the borders of their own regions, which would theoretically make it possible to retain the language and culture of the given nation, somewhere else if not here, abroad.

Every nation is unique in itself. Our press and television, in my opinion, are also guilty of tactlessness with regard to the Uzbek people when they pander to the philistines by smacking their lips over the so-called "Uzbek Affair." What do the Uzbeks have to do with it? Why this insult? Because this uniquely labor-loving nation has devoted its life to the thankless job of raising cotton? Because for decades cotton has served, among other things, as one of the main items bringing net currency into the state's treasury? If organized crime does exist in particular places, let the system of justice deal with it and leave the people's national dignity alone. (Applause). I would like to say the same thing in defense of the Crimean Tatars. Excuse me.

A.I. Lukyanov: Time. Please finish.

Ch. Aytmatov: How long are we going to avoid dealing with this glaringly tragic national fate? Yet in this context, the mass media (in particular TASS) continue to portray the matter as if that nation all but deserved the inhuman, genocidal act that took place. That is absurd. By what right is such an opinion shaped, a judgment handed down upon an entire nation? Who gives them that right? The Lord God Himself does not have that right. Was it only the Crimean Tatars who were found to include traitors and defectors during the war years, while other nations were guiltless? There's no such thing. War is war. It is a struggle, it is heroism and suffering, it is chaos and atrocities. It is captivity and betrayal. It is triumph and defeat. And all of this can affect any people, and we must deal with it dialectically rather than demeaning the honor of an entire nation. (Applause).

I cannot refrain from mentioning the injustice—which persists to this day—in regard to the German population of our country. Banished, scattered, and humiliated during the war years, they still suffer from political discrimination. Cultural and administrative autonomy for the Soviet Germans would benefit not only them but all of us. I have no doubt that German autonomy would set an example for all of us. (Applause).

Let us learn a lesson from our terrible past, so that it does not happen again in the future. We need to work out constitutional guarantees of the categorical inviolability of peoples as ethnic wholes, a categorical ban against deporting peoples for any political, official, or racial reasons or motives whatsoever, in order to guarantee equal justice for all. The place of every nation must be the place where it historically sprang up.

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Sergiyenko has the floor. Deputy Trudolyubov should get ready.

V.I. Sergiyenko, chairman of Krasnoyarsk Kray Soviet Executive Committee (Minusinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Krasnoyarsk Kray): Comrades! While supporting in principle the basic guidelines for domestic and foreign policy presented in Comrade Gorbachev's report to the Congress of People's Deputies, I would like to put forward some thoughts on my own understanding of the problems facing our society that we have to tackle. Recently, at the congress and elsewhere, we have heard a good many very harsh assessments of our history and reality. I think we have had quite enough of this to be able to move on to formulating proposals for rectifying the situation. In considering the question of power, many people see the main evil in the machinations of the apparatus. But since it is impossible to do without the apparatus entirely, and replacing some apparatus workers with others is hardly likely to amend matters significantly, I see it as one of the main tasks of the USSR Supreme Soviet and our congress not simply to formulate individual laws, however good and however necessary, but radically to improve our legislation with a view to creating a genuine mechanism of people's power, and to separate the legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

As an agrarian specialist I share and sympathize with the concerns and needs of our peasantry. Of course, I support the appeal of the group of people's deputies to the congress on this matter. But I cannot share the enthusiasm or the arguments of Comrade Chernichenko or many of his assessments and conclusions. I do not understand why such a serious journalist has to embellish his speech by accusing a party Central Committee secretary, in passing and without any serious arguments, of incompetence. (Applause).

From the congress platform there have unfortunately been many offensive remarks about individual deputies. And if in some cases apologies have followed, this is to some extent understandable. But the direct and as yet unsubstantiated accusation of a grave crime that was leveled again yesterday by Comrade Ivanov against a Politburo member is a more than serious matter. I know well Comrade Ligachev's selflessness, purposefulness, and energy in his work, and his modesty in personal life. I think the congress has a right to demand serious, substantiated arguments on the basis of which Comrade Ivanov makes this accusation. Otherwise it can be assessed not only as outright defamation of a party leader, but as another attempt to cast aspersions on the party itself. (Applause). On a party that has assumed full responsibility for the past and has proposed and taken the lead in the policy of restructuring and renewal.

In the course of further implementing radical restructuring of our economy, in my opinion, we need to make full use (as is proposed in Comrade Gorbachev's report) of both new approaches that have been tested in world economic practice and the principles of management that have proved themselves and are in use at the present time. In this connection I would like to emphasize that we do not have the right to dismiss the proposals of our scientists, the scientists of Moscow and the representatives of the Baltic republics. We must consolidate the congress not by subordinating one group to another but through the constructive use of everything proposed by the scientists and the group of deputies from Moscow and the Baltic republics. I propose that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government need to direct their efforts toward the formulation and adoption of decisions which will in practice enable us to create a socially oriented and highly effective economy. This will naturally require converting to the new model of economic mechanism based on a variety of forms of ownership, cost-accounting, leasing relations, radical reform of the banking system, and further democratization of the system of economic administration. For all the importance and urgency of doing away with the disproportions that have developed in the social sphere, in my opinion, further development must not be based on patching holes and shifting resources from one social problem to another one that is even more neglected. I think that under present circumstances we need a long-term social program based on the end goals of restructuring—that is, a unified program for radically improving the people's

standard of living, to include all its variegated components. It requires radical changes in content and the creation of working conditions worthy of a citizen in socialist society. It requires full, effective employment of the population, better health for the people, enhancing the population's culture in the broadest sense. None of these, of course, are easy matters. Only by dealing with them in an integrated manner, however, can we qualitatively raise the Soviet people's standard of living.

Considering the state of the economy today, we can obviously not do without a program of extraordinary measures to restore it to health. At the same time, despite the urgency of the economic situation, we must do everything possible to resolve the most vital task—that of meeting all of the people's food, consumer goods, and housing requirements in the next few years and cleaning up the ecological situation.

In [Krasnoyarsk] Kray we have formulated programs along these lines. With the support of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, they have been approved in USSR Gosplan and in the RSFSR Council of Ministers. We are doing work to implement them. Implementing these programs, however, will largely depend on the extent to which the USSR Government and Supreme Soviet, in their practical activities, especially in drawing up and approving the budget, focus attention on speeding the solution to social problems. Although I do not doubt the necessity of restricting capital investment (one of the most important measures in restoring the economy to health), I still think that we must not restrict volumes of capital investment to be carried out with the local soviets, because this capital investment is earmarked almost totally for the implementation of social programs.

I believe that the Supreme Soviet will have to do a lot of work to perfect the economic mechanism further. Life itself has put forward a number of vital issues that need to be resolved in practice. They include perfecting methods of centralized regulation, establishing a socialist market, restoring the financial health of the national economy, and further perfecting the organizational structure of production and administration. On the concrete plane, I think, radical improvements are needed in the practical formulation and setting of state orders [gosudarstvennyy zakaz], the system of payments for resources, and long-term economic normative, in particular special-purpose tax breaks to stimulate highly effective activities and promote resource-conserving and ecologically clean technologies. I believe that in the context of the economic situation developing today we will have to set aside retail price reform for a while, make adjustments in decisions taken previously, implement a program of measures (by way of preliminary conditions) to restore the economy to health, in particular saturate the consumers' market finally with goods and services, work out and implement a system of social guarantees, in particular for the less well-off strata of the population,

introduce a new pension law, raise the minimum wage, and increase aid to children and other benefits for families with many children.

The problem is so acute that we are simply obligated to find the funds for these needs in order to truly raise the standard of living of these categories of our citizens.

A vital constituent link in economic reform is the restructuring of the organizational structure of administration. I endorse the proposition in the report concerning the necessity of separating state administration of the economy from the functions of immediate management, the transition to primarily lateral links and relations, rational distribution of powers among all-union, republic, and local organs in order to provide conditions for territorial cost-accounting and self-administration.

As an officer in the soviets I take the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" primarily as a resolute reinforcement of the legal and financial base of the local organs of authority. Outwardly, the soviets already have considerable rights in dealing with all matters within their territory. In practice, however, any higher-level echelon has the right, claiming economic ineffectiveness, to reject practically any proposal by local soviets. The ispolkoms of the local soviets are constantly forced into the role of supplicants not only before the ministers but also before the enterprises located in their own territory. To a large extent this has brought about what we in Siberia, in particular Krasnoyarsk Kray, call the departments' colonial policy. It has brought about the rapid development of energy-intensive, ecologically dirty extractive operations and, at the same time, a serious lag in the development of the social sphere, light industry, food, and other sectors of industry that affect human beings. This is why I attach top authority to the Supreme Soviet's task of drawing up a number of legislative acts which will make the local soviets the true masters and plenipotentiary defenders of state and regional interests. In this context I believe that the present draft of the Law on Local Self-Administration and Local Economy is in need of very serious and detailed revision and perfection. Naturally, overcoming the disproportions in the development of the economy of our kray will require considerable effort and time. But there is one matter that is of fundamental importance to the kray's entire rural population, one which, it seems to us, the USSR Council of Ministers could settle without delay. I'm talking about the introduction of reduced rates on electricity supplied for the social and domestic needs of the countryside. In the context of the gigantic scale of energy construction that has been and is being carried out in the kray and which, let's be frank, does not always benefit the local population, we have the right to count on understanding and support in this matter, especially considering that this is one of the main mandates given to the many people's deputies from Krasnoyarsk by our constituents. I submit that serious adjustments are also needed in the practice of forming local budgets, as has been stated many times on this rostrum. Considering that the territory of the kray as a whole

annually generates about five billion rubles in profit and turnover tax, and that the kray's budget is just a little over one billion rubles, it is hard even to understand why this is happening, let alone explain it to the people. Of course, such a situation clearly does not constitute a stimulus to improve work.

Also in a difficult position today is routine administration within the territory of a kray where industrial units of all-union subordination predominate. The main planning-economic administrations of the ispolkoms of the kray and oblast soviets that have been created deal mainly only with matters of long-range and operational planning. It was thought that conversion to full cost-accounting and self-financing would automatically solve all problems stemming from the implementation of current plans. Practical experience has shown, however, that that has not happened yet. Quite the contrary: Administration of the region's economy has become considerably more difficult. Moreover, in addition to regional matters of transport, material support, and other inter-sectorial problems, fundamental new problems have arisen in the process of coping with new economic methods of management—those having to do with the territories' financial situation, issuing money, paying for trade turnover with resources, and increasing the production of consumer goods. And these matters are not being dealt with in the ispolkoms of the local soviets, not so much because of the absence of an appropriate apparatus—that is a problem which is very easy to resolve—but chiefly because there is no unified, integral concept, no legal normative base for territorial cost-accounting and regional administration of the economy. And this problem of ours is further aggravated by the necessity of seeking solutions in regard to administering the huge territorial-production complexes that have been created in the kray's territory.

I submit that drawing up legislative acts of this kind should also be one of the tasks of the Supreme Soviet and the government. Among the problems requiring immediate handling is that of a radical clean-up of the ecological situation that has developed in the kray as well as in a number of other regions of Siberia and the country as a whole. The approach here should be well-considered, of course, taking account of a great variety of aspects of the problem. In the case of a number of enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of Power and Electrification, the Ministry of Chemical Industry, and the Ministry of Timber Industry located in the kray, however, it is simply no longer possible to put off decisions, including such as restricting the capacity or restricting the construction, for example, of major hydroelectric plants. I believe that in its practical activities, the USSR Council of Ministers will have to become more deeply and objectively involved in matters of the ecology.

The composition of the kray includes three autonomous territorial formations, which impose their own characteristics on processes of administration. In light of this, it is necessary to ascertain the status of the autonomous

oblast, in particular with regard to expanding its prerogatives in implementing the integrated economic and social development of the territory. The problem of the socioeconomic development of the autonomous okrugs of the far north is especially acute. Essentially it is a matter of the survival of the nationalities living in these territories. For this reason, we expect the Supreme Soviet and the government to make radical decisions, backed up materially and economically, to promote fundamental changes for the better in the situation that has developed in the autonomous okrugs of the Far North. Among the mandates and requests which my constituents gave me as a deputy is the following: The time has come for practical work, a time requiring excellent discipline, responsibility, concrete deeds and concrete results in improving the life of every Soviet citizen. I consider it my duty to comply with this mandate. Thank you. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Deputy Aleksandr Ivanovich Trudolyubov. Next up will be Comrade Platonov.

A.I. Trudolyubov, chairman of Dnepr Kolkhoz, Smolensk Oblast, Kholm-Zhirkovskiy Rayon, village of Steshino, RSFSR (from the All-Union Komsomol): Esteemed comrades! There is a good old principle: If you don't agree, object; if you object, propose; if you propose, act. Everyone ought to follow that principle. (Applause). Life's experience shows, after all, that we have plenty of people who do not agree and no fewer people who object, and our greatest shortage is of people who actually do something. Therefore, in dealing with the tasks that face us today we cannot for one minute forget about people's day-to-day concerns. Today the people are counting on an improved supply of provisions, industrial goods, and housing; they demand the restructuring of public education, health care, culture, and solutions to a number of socioeconomic problems.

One of the speakers before me was Vasilii Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev. In his speech he said a lot that was correct. He expressed the thinking and aspirations of people in the villages. I would also like to dwell on the villages, but from a somewhat different angle. I would like to discuss the problem of the non-chernozem zone.

I am firmly convinced—this was mentioned also in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report and by many deputies who have spoken—that the main thing for us, of course, is to deal with the Food Program. If we can't feed the people, there will be no restructuring.

It is a disgrace that along these lines—resolving the food problem—numerous decisions have been made, the people have been getting promises that we would feed them, but no decisive changes have taken place. And the food problem, in particular for us of the non-chernozem zone, is more than just another economic problem—it is a social-political problem. At present the villages of the non-chernozem zone stand at the brink. This is not a metaphor,

not an exaggeration, and I am afraid we might take one more step forward. I am not overdramatizing the situation. It is really so. Resolution measures are needed.

The non-chernozem zone of Russia is not homogeneous. Smolensk Oblast is one of 29 oblasts. Therefore our oblast, mirror-like, reflects the problems of this vast region of the country where about half the population of the RSFSR lives. Concentrated there is a substantial proportion of the industry and cultural treasures of our Motherland.

Our region has also been getting attention. In the past 14 years, three decrees have been adopted on accelerating the region's development; this has to some extent made it possible to strengthen the production-economic potential of the non-chernozem zone's agro-industrial complex. Nevertheless, no radical breakthrough at all has taken place in the transformation of the countryside. It is not because our peasants are loafers and do not know how to work. It's not that at all. It is just that for a long time, other problems have been solved at the expense of the non-chernozem zone, in particular the development of the industrial centers of Russia's huge cities. And today, the villages of the non-chernozem zone have become essentially deserted.

Every year, 20,000 persons leave the communities and villages in our oblast alone; of them, only 10,000 move to the cities of Smolensk Oblast. The rest of them move to Moscow Oblast, Belorussia, Leningrad Oblast, and elsewhere. The intellectual potential is being eroded in the Smolensk countryside and a number of villages of the non-chernozem zone. And the deficit is being made up by people who are not needed in Moscow. I can cite examples from my own farm. They send people to the Smolensk region by the Chinese method, so to speak, for retraining, and these people bring with them their bad habits and their specific outlook on life. This poses a danger. I would even say it is worse than the ecological danger. They are ruining our peasants, let's put it that way.

The Smolensk region suffered terrible losses during the war years, but it suffered even more terribly from the decision concerning nonpromising villages [neperspektivnyye derevni]. I have always wondered who came up with the idea of foisting this proposal on the nonpromising villages on the government. (Applause).

The result in our region was that in 20 years, from 1965 through 1985, 2072 population centers disappeared from the face of the earth—places that had their own history, where people had lived and tilled the soil for a long time. Now they are no longer. It should be said, though, that the Smolensk area is a historical region. Aleksey Bodrenkov put it very well: "Before there was a Russian state, smoke rose from the forests at dawn, and before the rise of the cupolas of Moscow, Smolensk had risen on the Dnepr."

The fate of our Russia was very often decided in the Smolensk region. During the years of the Great Patriotic War, our fathers, grandfathers, and older brothers did not choose where they went to their grave. They found their final resting place in the Smolensk region: Russians and Tajiks, Armenians and Azerbaijanis, Georgians, Ossetians.... They did not spare their own lives in the defense of our land. What about now? That which they kept from the enemy, we are abandoning: The fields are growing wild, the villages are deserted, no one is left. Therefore I now appeal to all deputies: Comrades, colleagues, friends, anyone who has relatives who perished in the Smolensk region, come and see us, look upon this land and help us any way you can.

And now, on this point, a specific proposal. We have a number of benefits for the families of those who died, a number of benefits for veterans of the Great Patriotic War. But I would like to introduce one other benefit: the opportunity, once a year, to visit the grave of your fallen father, grandfather, or other relative. To me that's very important.

In addition to the neglect of the social sphere at present, the production base in the villages of the non-chernozem zone—the kolkhozes and sovkhoses [state farms]—is also very weak. One third of the livestock facilities in our rayon, for example, are in a dilapidated state and do not even have a book value. In short, comrades, the lack of elementary working and living conditions is literally driving people from the countryside.

It has been estimated that to make up the loss of one able-bodied rural inhabitant it is necessary to spend 20,000 rubles for the technical retooling of production. From 1975 on our oblast would require more than 2.5 billion rubles for these purposes. In fact, however, the growth of fixed productive capital in agriculture during that period totals only 1.3 billion rubles. On the whole, moreover, the level of available resources is very low. We have worked out a program which is called "Rebirth." It is a program which spells out the ways, means, and paths by which we may to some extent raise up our oblast, our non-chernozem zone. And in the first stage of this "Rebirth" program plans call for building up 52 of the most backward farms, which will require about a quarter of a billion rubles. I want to tell you that this program has found support among the people. Some 1500 Komsomol members are ready to go out to the lagging farms, and efforts are underway to attract funds from enterprises, organizations, and voluntary public contributions. At present, about 10 million rubles earned on subbotniks [volunteer Saturday work] have come in to a special account, and people are contributing from their own savings.

We understand that we ourselves will have to earn most of the funds to carry out our program, but this might postpone the accomplishment of the task set before us to a later date and further aggravate the situation in the countryside.

Therefore, on behalf of all the inhabitants of the Smolensk region I appeal to the new government to grant an additional 500 million rubles for the social development of the Smolensk countryside.

Please understand, comrades, that we do not want to display ourselves in the skimpy blanket of our budget, but it is simply necessary. It is calculated that these 52 farms alone, once they begin operating normally, can produce 100 million per year. And I think in addition that there should be a temporary halt to the construction of industrial enterprises in the territory of the oblast. On the one hand, this will make it possible to reduce the migration from the villages; on the other hand, it will help channel the forces of the contracting organizations into construction on the kolkhozes and sovkhoses.

What I have said by no means implies that I am against industrial development. Stagnation is equally unacceptable, especially for a mighty power like ours. But the main emphasis, I think, should be placed on remodeling and modernizing industrial enterprises. Meanwhile the ministries, through Gosplan, continue under various pretexts to impose more and more new projects on us. There are about 3000 of them in the oblast's territory today. The balance of the estimated cost comes to more than 2 billion rubles. Just to complete all these projects will require about five years. Meanwhile, we have calculated that for my own out-of-the-way Kholm-Zhirkovskiy Rayon it will take 50 years at the present pace of construction to build the minimum roads we need.

Meanwhile, another proposal has been made. The ministries have decided to expand practically all of our major enterprises. To man the planned facilities will require 35,000 to 40,000 persons, again at the expense of the villages. As STROITELNAYA GAZETA aptly put it recently, the Smolensk region has fallen under the wheels of industrial expansion.

One more matter that I would like to consider is the work of the soviets. The work of the soviets has also been the subject of a number of generally rather good decrees. But most of the fundamental provisions of these decrees have not been backed up by legislative acts. This has made itself felt especially now, when the enterprises have converted to full cost-accounting and self-financing. According to legislation presently in force, the soviet is supposed to provide for integrated social and economic development within its territory, but it does not have the necessary funds. This is especially true of the village soviets. For this reason, I endorse the proposal that has been made by a number of deputies to the effect that 10 to 15 percent of the deductions of capital investments of industrial enterprises and other enterprises should go into the fund of the village soviets.

There is one other matter I would like to bring up—namely, the issue of social justice. Our oblast produces about 674 kilograms of milk and almost 90 kilograms of meat per inhabitant. This is one of the best statistics in

Russia. In terms of consumption of these products, however, we rank far below first place. This is primarily because more than half of state milk deliveries and about the same amount of meat deliveries are shipped to other regions; for the republic as a whole, these indicators are barely over half that. And so, "the injured winds up carrying the uninjured." These conditions were laid down a long time ago and do not take account of the fact that the oblast's growing industrialization alone increased the number of workers by 100,000, quite apart from the urban population as a whole, yet food stocks have remained unchanged. Frankly, our neighbors in Belorussia and the Baltic region live much better. And every day it becomes much harder to explain to the people why this is. But perhaps it is not necessary to explain. It would probably be much better to resolve this issue once and for all through legislation. Everyone should contribute equally to all-union stocks depending on their resource potential. In this way, people will be genuinely interested in the end results. Whoever works better should live better.

A final matter, comrades, so that I might not take any more time. I am a deputy from the Komsomol and, naturally, I am very concerned about the problems of youth. These problems are reflected in condensed form in the draft of the USSR Law on Youth and state youth policies. Some of you have studied it and some have not. Let me say one thing. This law stipulates practically no special benefits for young people. I would call it a law on the future. It is a law which gives young people a start so that they may get involved sooner in our social production, so that they may benefit our country and our people sooner. Therefore I ask all deputies to study it carefully and not reject it out of hand. Look at it carefully so that this law may be passed at the next session of the Supreme Soviet or the autumn session of the congress. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Deputy Platonov. Next up will be Deputy Kiseleva.

Yu.P. Platonov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Architects Union (from the USSR Architects Union): Esteemed comrade deputies! Concerning the country's architecture and city planning, how do things stand? Not very good. The new cities and villages are monotonous, lack character, and are unlivable. Naturally, there have been some successes in a big country like this. We always look for them in order to award State and Lenin Prizes. There is Kiev, and Minsk, and Lithuania, and others. The so-called successful projects of recent years have been accomplished at the cost of enormous difficulty, slowly, at considerable cost, and not thanks to but in spite of. None of the other arts are tied so closely to production and the economy as is architecture. This makes architectural creation even more crucial to society and the state.

Comrade deputies! I beg you to return in fancy to your own cities, communities, and villages. Not to the downtown sections, which are sometimes decently clean and

where the main buildings and amenities have been put up with unbelievable care through the concentration of resources and manpower from the enterprises and institutions. I mean the old districts of the cities, worn out from so-called exploitation and from the senseless painting of pedestals for every big celebration, with their broken-down facades and mutilated entryways, with their headless churches awaiting restoration. Return in fancy to the new projects, the boundless proving grounds of the products of the building construction combines, where the people are able to pick out their own entrances by individual features known only to them—sidewalk curbstones turned upside-down, puddles, doors with smashed windows. Recall these districts without landmarks, without information, without cultural and recreational facilities.

You and I know that the rate of social disorders, crime rates, and the rate of uncared-for children are higher there, as was remarked upon here by Comrade Likhanov. Among many other factors, the spiritual barrenness of the environment is to blame.

Architecture is always an objective portrait of its time. However sad it is to acknowledge, the architecture of many of our cities and villages is also an objective portrait of our attitudes toward people, human beings. It is a portrait of our attitudes toward ourselves, our own culture. What we need is revolutionary changes in the condition of the cities, settlements, and villages. This position has been voiced in many letters to our deputy group.

Thus, the Council of Chief Architects of the Country's Cities, which assembled in conference in Riga on 25-26 May of this year—that is, during the days of the congress—writes as follows: "...we request that you speak at the congress and focus attention on the necessity of changing present practices of city planning, in which narrowly departmental interests are placed above universal human interests. Numerous examples confirm the necessity of an integrated, thoroughly considered, comprehensively substantiated set of decisions in matters of urban development, decisions which will rule out disruption of the ecological balance and degradation of the existing ecosystem and cultural potential of individual regions, cities, and communities."

The Council of Chief Architects of the Country's Cities has raised the issue of the necessity of adopting national legislation on urban development, to be linked obligatorily with the law on local self-administration. The council points out that it is necessary to stipulate by law the actual rights of the chief architects of cities under conditions of raising the responsibility of the local soviets.

The council of chief architects goes on to point out: "It is necessary to raise the issue of revising the long-range program of housing construction, to be linked with the program's actual material-technical foundation, without damaging the architectural-esthetic quality of the environment to be created."

Another thing. This is from a note sent to me by Deputy Yeraliyev from Alma-Ata. He writes: "Designs for the new types of housing are not being adopted because the builders are not interested. The reason stems from present economic relations." He points out their complete indifference to the social and climatic characteristics of a region. Take, for example, the city of Gulsary, Guryev Oblast. It experiences frequent dust storms and temperatures of 40 degrees above and 40 degrees below zero with high winds. To this day, however, the city does not have a single residential building designed especially for the region, despite the explicit decisions of the chairman of USSR Gosstroy that were taken back in 1987. In conclusion, the deputy from Alma-Ata writes: "The country's construction complex needs to be reorganized immediately. The way things stand today, the Housing-2000 Program could be a failure."

In his report, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated that housing is one of the most vital problems and that we must tackle it with everything we have. We must find the funds and resources and accomplish the program "An Apartment or House for Every Family." But it is more than just a matter of housing. It is the whole infrastructure, both technical and social, kindergartens, schools, hospitals, clubs, sports facilities and so on, parks, squares, roads, and, finally, the restoration of historic places—the entire manmade environment, i.e. the architecture in the midst of which we are born, live, and work. It must be an esthetically designed environment for life.

What is to be done? In his report the speaker mentioned the dictatorship of the contract system, the departments; this theme also runs through excerpts from the letters I have read. The economic and production mechanism we have inherited from previous years, the mechanism of carrying out architectural and urban development designs, is based on the embarrassingly backward technologies of the long-ago 1930s and 1940s, standardized, monotonous designs producing defective construction all over the country. Recently a group of American architects inspected construction projects in Moscow. Their reaction was that this kind of construction cannot be; the American economy would not stand for that kind of construction. Projects that drag on for years, wastage of materials, lack of technology. But how to accomplish the task? It is very dangerous to say, "First we do the meters, then you'll get your architecture." The pressure is strong, everything is in the hands of the contractor, and his powerful technical base—mainly panel housing construction—is geared to "gross output." If you don't simply chop out the brambles, they will all grow back. There is no other base; we have to work with it and we must get moving. But a thorough modernization of this industry is necessary and possible. People in the world have long since learned how to do first-class building, including the use of panels—in France, for example. This work must be done on the go, so to speak. We must also restore to the arsenal of construction the use of framing, on-site casting, brick, stone, wooden, and metal

techniques. World practice demonstrates that interweaving these systems in urban development makes it possible to create complex, multifaceted cities, communities, and buildings, and spaces commensurate with man to restore to him the feeling that, This is my home, my street, my courtyard, and in this way to restore the vital feeling of patriotism.

The thesis of the report concerning the necessity of shifting funds from defense and utilizing the technological capabilities of the special sectors and imports for the most urgent social needs also ought to be channeled into architecture and construction, into attaining a modern level of construction practice. Simultaneously it is essential to remodel the very system of organization of the construction contract and the construction industry. It is also necessary to decentralize the contract system, project planning, and orders. We need alternative systems of organization; we need competition, not in order to destroy but to strengthen; we need to find the best possible organization of the country's construction complex, get rid of the unwieldy, multi-level construction committees, and break up the pyramid of the all-union contract system in civilian construction. Every city, every village, every community ought to have its own contract system.

This process is already underway. A system of small organizations which make it possible to react quickly to orders is beginning to take shape. The USSR Architects Union is itself actively developing a system of design bureaus and organizations of the Arkhproyekt All-Union Association; there are already about 200. In less than a year, the volume of completed project-planning work in the state valuation system has risen to 50 million rubles. This organizational system simultaneously makes it possible to make more effective use of the architect and his labors in our country, and we have only one fifth or one sixth as many architects per 100,000 inhabitants as in the highly developed countries.

We have also thought about and begun to create small, mobile construction firms known as Arkhstroy. They have already begun to operate jointly with state organizations and foreign firms in Georgia and in the Moscow area, for example. They, together with the forces of the production cooperatives, plus all the other kinds of contract organizations, ought to become a serious force in resolving the problem of housing construction. Because we will never accomplish the "2000" Program via the state system alone.

We need to return to clear and simple truths. The cities and villages cannot be built for the arithmetical average man on behalf of the arithmetical average client or yet the sometimes subordinate contractor, as has happened in Moscow, for example.

The city, the village, the house must have its master, its client (the soviet, collective, cooperative, or citizen) and its specific architect, its specific builder. Look, whose interests are hurt? No one's. Who's indifferent or anonymous? No one. That's morality; that's economics.

When that terrible earthquake struck Armenia, my observations caused me to reflect that the buildings that stood up were those bearing the name of the architect, the client, and the builder; the structures that stood up had been built in both the prerevolutionary period and the Soviet period. The ones that fell were no one's. What stood up was responsibility.

A shelter bears special responsibility toward people. A shelter should protect them. It must hold up under extreme conditions until people leave it. Herein lies the supreme purpose of the architect's remarkable profession. People have assigned and entrusted it to him. Yet we have distorted this purpose, having placed funds above the goal.

I began this discussion with the subject of the funds necessary to accomplish the task because the lack of them and backwardness in construction technologies constitute an obstacle to the development of architecture and urban development; they make it difficult to carry out the "2000" Program. But the chief obstacle to the rational development of our cities and communities is the lack of a law, legislation on urban development, which would block the monopolies of the departments and the contract system. It is time to give the force of law to the architectural project design in this country. Approved by soviet authority, it will be subject to execution. Then what ought to happen will happen. The department, the contractor, and the industry will have to exert themselves, seek ways and means to carry out the project, and both architecture and construction will begin to develop. Reflecting as it does a social task, the project design is simultaneously the sole engine of progress in construction. I want to tell you that in recent times our potential capabilities in architecture have been very high. We are winning in an endless number of international contests, yet we can't do anything here at home. At present any project design, frequently even a rather talented one, is subject to various changes.

After the design is accepted by the soviet, the architect takes it to the contractor for consultation, and the latter adjusts it to fit his capabilities. And that's the whole trouble! None of us want that kind of construction, but it bypasses our will. Imagine for a moment the same kind of situation in aviation. If it were like that in aviation, we would still be flying around in PO-2 airplanes. It is time to overthrow this monopoly by law.

The architects union has started working on architectural-urban development legislation. It turns out that we are the only developed country without such legislation, yet our work is regulated by 14,000 legally binding acts, SNiPs [Construction Norms and Regulations], and directives, but where there is no law, as we know, there is lawlessness. This legislation will have to cover the investment relations of the client, the architect, and the

builder, coordinate their activities, and protect their interests, in particular author's rights. And, especially, this legislation will become an instrument of authority in the hands of the soviets.

This work has come from above and from below. Following Kiev, a number of cities have adopted a scale of land prices. This is an excellent tool in the hands of the soviets.

We are presently collaborating with the Institute of State and Law on draft legislation, and we are studying world experience. In the United States, for example, there is a well-developed functioning system of legal documents relating to these matters; there are laws on the federal, state, and city level. It is interesting to note, for example, that San Francisco and other cities of America do not permit the construction of two identical buildings. Also in America there is a strict system which protects society against unprofessional interference. In the sphere of architecture, this function is performed, by law, only by the American Architects Union. We are sorely in need of such a law!

Here among the cathedrals of the Kremlin, we understand, I think, that architecture is more than a product of cement; it is above all the product of spirit and lofty ideas.

I would like to conclude with an ancient thought that comes from Greece: Only he who constantly feels the hand of his grandson in his own hand has the right to engage in architecture. That's responsibility to the future!

Architect deputies make the following proposal (there are 13 of us here—10 from the architects union, one from the Academy of Arts, one from the territory, and one, as you know from the newspapers, is the chief architect of restructuring): We believe that the problems of architecture, of the integrated development of cities and villages, must be dealt with constantly in the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for urban planning and architecture. In this connection, a request to the government: Nikolay Ivanovich, take your time in adopting new decrees designed to improve architecture and construction. We members of a creative workers' union want to and will be in the center of this work in the parliament, with the government and the party. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies, before declaring recess, I want to announce the following. A request has come from Deputy Shamikhin: "I request that the presidium announce the schedule of the congress and the Supreme Soviet for Saturday." This is of interest to many.

What are the plans for this Saturday? The congress has worked hard, so we think that most of the participants in the congress, deputies, ought to take a rest on Saturday.

Tomorrow, Saturday, in accordance with the wishes of many deputies, plans have been made for the people's deputies, if they wish, to visit a number of rayons,

enterprises, and institutions in Moscow and Moscow Oblast, and to meet with representatives of labor collectives. I should tell you that many labor collectives would like to meet with the deputies from various regions of the country.

Plans call for organizing a visit to a residential micro-rayon, a sports complex in the Krylatskoye, and a number of enterprises and organizations in several rayons around Moscow. Announcements can be found at the registration places. You have seen them, so we ask you to make your wishes known during the break so that we can organize these excursions.

In addition, there will be an announcement about an exhibition of space technology, where, incidentally, deputies can get information about, first of all, how much it costs, what the money is being spent for, and what our space technology is working on.

Deputies desiring to take part in all these events are requested to register.... We hereby take a recess of 30 minutes.

(Recess).

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies, we have to save time. Our session continues. The Belorussian delegation has made a substitution: The floor is turned over to Deputy Tkacheva. Next up will be Comrade Ardzinba.

Z.N. Tkacheva, department head, Slavgorod Central Rayon Hospital, city of Slavgorod (Krychev Territorial Election District, Mogilev Oblast): Esteemed comrade deputies! I am speaking at the behest of the deputies of Mogilev and Gomel oblasts as well as other districts—Momotova, Zhukovskaya, Golovnevo, Feskovo, and others, also on behalf of our constituents who live in the contaminated rayons of these oblasts.

A bit about myself: I am a pediatrician with 20 years of service. I could not respect myself if I did not raise the following issues from this rostrum today. As of the present day we, the inhabitants of these rayons, have had our clean land, water, air, forests, and meadows taken away from us, things without which man cannot live but can only exist. The press, the official statements of the Ministry of Health, and the 29 May 1989 edition of PRAVDA fail to reflect adequate concern for people's health and the fate of future generations. It is the first time such an accident has happened, after all, and so there is no observation experience in world practice. It's true there have been no substantial changes as yet in the overall morbidity pattern, although the first portents are already there: Children being born with congenital cataracts; impaired vision; lowered immunity; higher levels of anemia; myocardial infarction. It is still too early now to go by figures; we will do that in 10 to 15 years from now. What we have to do now is focus on the qualitative side of illnesses, that is, their course. And in my opinion, as of the present day this question has not been studied

at all, because it is not reflected in a single report. In order to study the behavior of animals, biologists move in next to them and live with them for years. That's what medical doctors ought to do. After all, the complaints being brought in to us by the people of these rayons—excessive fatigue, lack of energy, headaches, and dryness of the mouth—do not fit into a single nosological disease classification.

I believe that scientists have failed to deal with the task that is entrusted to them. This applies both to medical doctors and biophysicists. And I wonder if it wouldn't be better for us to turn for help to foreign scientists, whose equipment is more reliable and whose experience is greater. After all, it is not just the fate of a particular region but of the Belorussian nation as a whole that is being decided today.

It has to be said that practicing physicians' assessment of the health of the people living in the contaminated rayons is increasingly at odds with the assessment by medical scientists and officials of the country's health care system. I can compare the discrepancy, because I have been living in this territory many years and I can see the changes in people's health before and since the accident. Specialists who come to see us, especially those of high rank, spend a few hours or days with us and then try to persuade us that the people's health is not getting worse. They attribute the changes to whatever suits them. Nitrates, poor nutrition, or the lack of breast-feeding, but not to the presence of the radioactive factor. But all of those things were present before. And we could tell them that although these factors might aggravate the harmful effect of the radiation, they are by no means the cause of that effect.

The tension of the psychological atmosphere has been aggravated in a number of cases by the publication of conflicting data and sometimes simple rumors. This is fostered by differences of opinion that have arisen among scientists. To put an end to these differences of opinion, our academicians must speak with authority.

Unfortunately, the USSR Academy of Sciences and the coordination center affiliated with its presidium have distanced themselves from this complex and very crucial problem. The organization and provision of medical services leave much to be desired. To this day we have received no help in regard to improving the supply of medical equipment, medicines, gear, and cadres. The parent institutes have failed to provide us with special methods of observation enabling us to diagnose the early and long-term consequences of radiation. We lack recommendations as to the particulars of the treatment and prevention of somatic disorders against the background of the effect of various doses of radiation.

This is quite aside from the obligatory recommendation that the population be supplied with clean foodstuffs. Obligatory recommendations on sending children outside the republic every year to recover their health are

not being complied with either. Like the other deputies, I think that at present we cannot provide guarantees that it is safe to live within the territory of the contaminated rayons. Moreover, scientists of the Biophysics Institute of the USSR Ministry of Health are predicting an additional rise in malignant forms (leukemia, birth defects), although not in a very high percentage of cases. For everyone who lives there, a minimum fraction of a percent is quite sufficient.

All of this creates a tense atmosphere in these areas. We deem it advisable to implement a planned, stage-by-stage resettlement of people from the contaminated rayons, because practical experience shows that it is not we who are controlling the situation, however much we may desire it; the situation is controlling us. At meetings with our constituents, the people demanded that the resettlement issue be resolved; at present, people are still living in places where the total radiation dosage exceeds the safety concept by 35 rem. I cannot forget the eyes of my constituents at these meetings, when they demanded immediate resettlement. We offer them state sausage, individual dosimeters, and tractors with hermetically sealed cabs. They don't want any of that. They ask to be moved out as soon as possible in order to live a normal life, have their own household plot, and engage in farming. It's frightening just to think about it.

The people want to be compensated by the state for the losses they suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident. They demand that a shorter work service life be set for people working in plants, organizations, medical facilities, schools, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes, based on the conditions of the harm of radioactive damage. They demand additional pay from ministry and departmental funds, in the amount of 10 percent of salaries or wage rates for every year worked, starting as of 1 May 1986, for all workers and employees in the territories of the contaminated rayons. They want additional pay from the state budget for non-working pensioners and non-working members of families, in the amount of 30 rubles per month. They want additional pay for working pensioners in the amount of 25 percent of wage rates or salaries, to come from ministry and departmental funds. Mothers with children up to the age of three, preschool institutions and schools with students up to the age of 14, along with their teachers, cooks, and medical personnel, must, on completion of the school year, be taken out of the contaminated zone for health treatment for a period of three months, to be paid out of the state budget; a health recovery center must be built in the uncontaminated zone for all workers in the contaminated zone, at state expense. Only those foodstuffs which are free of radioactivity must be supplied; decontamination work must be made more effective; the construction of roads, powerlines, and gas pipelines must be accelerated; and major resources and funds must be channeled into the effort.

We are completing the draft of a state program for 1990-1995 which calls for resettling people from areas where it is impossible to live, and implementing a

complex of measures to convert to normal living conditions. We hope that the newly created government will examine and approve this program. Carrying it out will require considerable capital investments which, under the difficult circumstances, the republic is not in a position to handle. In connection with this we request that the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers provide us the necessary help. Considering the special importance and the long-term nature of problems associated with liquidating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station], it seems to us that a permanent organ needs to be created in the country in order to ensure that these problems do not have to be dealt with by volunteer efforts [na obshchestvennykh nachalakh], as is being done now. It could comprise an extraordinary commission and a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers for these matters.

I support Deputy Konstantin Aleksandrovich Khlebts-ov's proposal on the creation of such an organ within the USSR Supreme Soviet, one having legislative authority.

I hereby submit to the congress for discussion the proposal by Albert Likhonov, chairman of the board of the V. I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund, that another all-union subbotnik be held on 1 June and that all the proceeds be used to help the children of Chernobyl, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, to organize family-style children's homes, and to build a health recovery complex in the Crimea for orphaned children and the children of Chernobyl. (Applause).

These matters are reflected in my constituents' appeal to the congress, which was adopted at a rally held during our work. Allow me to submit this appeal to the presidium of the congress. I also request that a response be made during the congress to the requests of the Belorussian deputies on this matter, which have been turned over to the secretariat of the congress.

Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Z.N. Tkacheva hands the document to the presidium of the congress.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrades, let's please maintain order.

From the floor: (Inaudible).

A.I. Lukyanov: Excuse me, let's please respect the congress and ourselves.

The floor is turned over to Deputy Vladislav Grigoryevich Ardzinba. Next up will be Deputy Peters.

V.G. Ardzinba, doctor of historical sciences, director of the D.I. Gulia Abkhazian Institute of Language, Literature, and History, Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences,

city of Sukhumi (Gudauta City National-Territorial Election District, Abkhazian ASSR): Esteemed comrade deputies! It should hardly be necessary to argue the point that the future of every nation in our great Motherland depends on resolving a number of the country's shared problems, because all parts of this unitary whole are interconnected and interdependent. One may single out a number of problems, among which, it seems to me, special importance must attach to the creation of a state of law. At the same time, I cannot in any way agree with certain assertions that have been voiced at our congress to the effect that the problems of individual regions must be set aside in the interests of concerns affecting the whole state, assertions that they must wait.

It is unthinkable that concerns of the whole state can be dealt with without taking account of the problems and interests of all the regions of the country, regardless of where they lie. I draw your attention to this problem because only a few of the speeches that have been made in this hall have touched upon the problems of the smaller nations, that is, peoples having small populations. Basically the discussion has been about the union republics, the restructuring of their relations with the Center and the expansion of their rights. In this connection, something has to be said about the fact that any realization of the idea of the greatest possible sovereignty for the union republics, "strong union republics," it seems to me, is cause for definite disquiet among all the peoples which have not made it into the group of 15 "strong republics," the total number of which adds up to 65 in this hall alone; they add up to even more in the country as a whole. Some of them have their own forms of national-state structure, while others are deprived of any forms of national-cultural autonomy whatsoever. Moreover, a mass of problems arises for a non-native [inonatsionalnyy] population living outside the borders of its own national territory. Hence, the restructuring of interethnic relations must encompass a whole complex of problems. Otherwise, serious difficulties are inevitable, sharp conflicts on an ethnic basis. The legal status of an autonomous republic as stipulated in the present Constitution leads in effect to national inequality and lack of equal rights. This kind of ranking of nations is the direct "legacy" of Stalinism as well as an administrative-command system which in effect leads to homogenization, and this is especially detrimental to the autonomous entities. This situation can be illustrated by the example of the development of the Soviet statehood of the Abkhazian people, similar to that of other autonomous entities.

Soviet power was established in Abkhazia on 4 March 1921. The Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia was proclaimed. Under pressure from Stalin, in December 1921 the Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia concluded a treaty of alliance with the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia, which was in force until 1931. In legal terms, this alliance meant the creation of a federation based on the equal rights and sovereignty of both republics. Thus, for example, Article 4 of the Abkhazian

Constitution states: "The Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia shall exercise independent state authority within its territory, since this authority is not restricted by treaty relations with the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia and the constitutions of the Transcaucasian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." This sovereignty was also reflected in the existence of Abkhazia's own code of arms, flag, and a number of legal codes and legislative acts. In reality, however, the treaty marked the beginning of the liquidation of Abkhazia's sovereignty.

In 1931, the treaty-based Abkhazia was converted into a mere autonomous republic within the Georgian SSR. In this way, Abkhazia became practically the only republic whose political status was changed, at Stalin's will, from the top down rather than from the bottom up.

Today we know a great deal about the mass repressions against the Soviet people and whole nations during the years of the cult of personality. In the history of the Abkhazian people, the years 1937 through 1953 marked a period in which the question of the liquidation of the nation as such was a real one. The fact that this question was actually raised and dealt with is attested by a whole aggregate of repressive actions against the Abkhazians. The nation was rendered leaderless; all of the most prominent state and party leaders of Abkhazia were destroyed, along with the intelligentsia that was just then emerging. The peasantry suffered mass repressions. Starting in 1940, the Abkhazian nation was no longer called "the Abkhazian nation." Starting in 1941, radio broadcasts in Abkhazian were halted. In 1945-1946, Abkhazian schools were closed and the teachers were shut out. There were practically no Abkhazians in the party and soviet organs of leadership. Forcible massive migration to Abkhazian was begun. Vast sums were spent on this resettlement, which was not halted even during the difficult years of 1941-1942. Greeks, Turks, and other peoples were moved out of Abkhazia, and their homes were turned over to settlers from rayons in Georgia. Because of this artificial population growth, Abkhazians became a minority in their own ancient homeland. The ancient names of places in Abkhazia were subjected to repressions. Between 1948 and 1951 alone, 147 place names were changed in that manner. Concerning the nature of policies during that time, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, who used to be first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, has said: "It must be stated frankly that in the past, during the period you all know, the Abkhazian people were subjected to policies which must be characterized as in effect chauvinistic—let's call things by their right names—which were radically in conflict with the interests of the Georgian people as well as the interests of the Abkhazian people, the interests of strengthening the Leninist friendship of the Soviet peoples."

Meanwhile, the official denunciation of the "cult of personality" at the 20th Party Congress did not result in the liquidation of the "legacy" of Stalinism. This

"legacy" is making itself felt to this day. Serious violations in the sphere of national policies with respect to the Abkhazian people were recounted in collective and individual letters sent to the Central party and soviet organs by representatives of various segments of the Abkhazian people—the intelligentsia, the working class, and the peasantry—in 1947, 1957, 1967, 1978, and 1988.

In the first stages after such appeals, certain measures were taken to improve the situation that had developed in the autonomous republic. Some time later, however, one would observe a reversion to the situation which the representatives of the Abkhazian people had complained about.

The situation became especially difficult in late 1988. At rallies in Tbilisi there were calls to liquidate the already truncated Abkhazian autonomy. One of the informal societies drew up a special program to fight the Abkhazian nation and its cultural institutions. It is curious to note that this society, whose members consider themselves fighters for democracy, proclaim in this program they have drawn up that "the years 1936-1954 witnessed an end to the domination of the separatists and the violence of the Apsui (author's note: That's what they call the Abkhazians) against other nations living in the Abkhazian ASSR." From the standpoint of these "democrats," in other words, the best years were those when the Abkhazian nation was being destroyed. Representatives of these "democrats" headed for Abkhazia to foment anti-Abkhazian sentiments among the local Georgian population. And by December of last year they managed to organize an unauthorized rally in Sukhumi and marches around the city.

Not only the Abkhazians but also other inhabitants of the republic were seriously disturbed by the drafting and discussion of the draft state program for the development of the Georgian language, which calls for the use of Georgian as the only official language in all institutions, and for compulsory teaching of it to every inhabitant of the republic. Again, this reopened unhealed wounds and reminded us of the gross distortions of the history of the Abkhazian nation and the trampled rights of Abkhazian autonomy.

Abkhazian society was especially disturbed by the fact that these actions were not properly assessed by the leadership of the union republic.

All of this taken together brought it about that an authorized rally was held on 18 March 1989 in the village of Lykhny, on the historic square where issues vital to the fate of the nation have been resolved since ancient times, during which an appeal was adopted and sent to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and a number of other institutions. Affixed to it were the signatures of about 32,000 persons, including officials of a number of higher party and soviet organs and all deputies of Abkhazian nationality. The appeal was also signed by more than 5000 Russians, Armenians,

Greeks, Georgians, and representatives of other peoples. The appeal requested that the status of a Soviet Socialist Republic, which Abkhazia had had in 1921 while V. I. Lenin was alive, be reinstated.

Contrary to some claims, this does not entail the secession but rather the reinstatement of the status of "Treaty-Based Abkhazia." According to the 1921 treaty between the Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia and the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia, that status gave Abkhazia the ability to decide its own fate independently in the event that the question of another union republic's secession from the USSR should arise, because the Abkhazian people believe that membership in the USSR is the only possible way to preserve their national distinctiveness. (Applause). I believe that this alliance treaty experience can be utilized in drafting normative acts that regulate relations between other autonomous formations and the particular republics they form part of.

The purpose of the appeal was to expand the republic's rights in the interests of all the multinational population of the Abkhazian ASSR, and it does not confer privileges on any people. The appeal is in no way directed against the Georgian people, with whom we desire to continue to live in peace and friendship.

Statements from the rostrum of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet on 29 March 1989 assessing this appeal as contrary to the spirit of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the orientation of the 19th all-union party conference are absolutely groundless. It would seem the Abkhazian people did not have a legal right to express their opinion; the organs of the union republic had decided the fate of Abkhazian autonomy long before the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on interethnic relations. The assessments by the union republic's leadership fomented an even bigger campaign which has not died down to this day, as is attested, in particular, by articles appearing in the press even as the congress is in session.

At meetings with officials who came to Tbilisi after the tragic events, representatives of the Georgian intelligentsia attempted to claim that the cause of what had happened was the "Lykhny Appeal," although the events in Tbilisi were caused by other things and pursued other goals. We are very sorry about the tragedy that took place in Tbilisi, we are deeply sympathetic, and we believe that these events must be thoroughly and completely investigated and that the guilty must get what they deserve.

The restoration of Georgian statehood was observed in the Abkhazian ASSR on 26 May 1988. It is the job of historians to assess the significance of this event in the life of the Georgian nation. In the history of the Abkhazian nation, meanwhile, these events are linked with a state system which in 1918 drowned the Abkhazian Bolshevik Commune in blood and then instituted terror in the villages of Abkhazia. This celebration has led the Abkhazian and Georgian population of the autonomous republic to the brink of conflict. According to numerous

telegrams, telephone messages, and other reports that have been coming in to us, the situation in Abkhazia remains tense to this day. Unless urgent measures are taken, something irreparable could happen.

Unfortunately, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have maintained silence in the face of the request of a group of deputies from the Abkhazian ASSR, which was submitted on 25 May of this year. We urgently request that all people's deputies of the USSR support our proposal to create a special commission, made up of people's deputies, to study the situation in the sphere of interethnic relations in Abkhazia.

It would be desirable to have a permanent commission, made up of people's deputies of the USSR, to study the problems of the autonomous formations, in order to relieve tensions in the most difficult regions and not allow things to reach the point of conflict. Our request, which relates to the Abkhazian ASSR, is dictated by the fact that extremist forces have shifted the epicenter of tension to Abkhazia in order, we think, to provoke people to conflict and then blame it on our people. To make us the guilty ones is not difficult, because the mass propaganda media are purveying one-sided information, and representatives of the Abkhazian people are deprived of the right to express their point of view. I would like to note that the people understand the necessity of maximum restraint and calm, because the future of restructuring, the future of our great Motherland, depends on it. And we deputies are doing and are obligated to do everything we can along those lines.

A few more concrete proposals. First, to institute a system of public hearings and scientific appraisals in the chambers and commissions of the Supreme Soviet on questions of interethnic relations in the USSR.

Second, to create a commission on national groups and national minorities in the Chamber of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of the union republics.

Third, it is essential to return to the original principles of Soviet rule, to the Leninist resolution of the national question, which is based on the "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia." A decision to create a deputies' commission to study the situation in the Abkhazian ASSR will introduce calm in the hearts of the people and restore their faith in the triumph of justice.

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to deputy Yanis Yanovich Peters. Next up will be Viktor Amazaspovich Ambartsumyan.

I see by the clock that the preceding speaker spoke for 14 and a half minutes. Please observe the time limits.

Ya.Ya. Peters, writer, chairman of the Latvian SSR Writers' Union Board, Riga City (Valmiyevskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): Esteemed chairman, people of like mind, people not of like mind, comrade deputies! (Stir in the auditorium, applause).

In the very center of Moscow, greeting the participants in the Congress of People's Deputies and the Muscovites, there hangs a banner which says: "Restructuring—the rebirth of the Leninist face of socialism." I read this fine phrase, and shuddered. What if this is just another flight of poetic fancy—a watchword that we will regard tomorrow with the same bitter irony as the promise that the present generation of Soviet people will live under communism?

I look at the sole historical territory of my forebears, my homeland—Latvia, and I think bitterly: How can it be made into a state that is not even Leninist, but simply normal, not humiliated by all-union monopolies, not poisoned by irresponsible economic activity on the part of irresponsible authorities that are subordinate to no one? How can we ensure that the USSR Council of Ministers allocates, for instance, to the city of Ventspils a mere 1 percent of the currency from the huge proportion of income that it contributes to the all-union budget, paying for it with terrible diseases and deaths among its inhabitants, including abnormalities in pregnant women and their offspring?

I look at Latvia and I think not so much of "rebirth" as of how to stop the death of my people, because the results of pragmatic, economically invalid actions are already visible. Because of spontaneous migration, the numbers of the indigenous nation in their own territory are approaching the critical minority point. Each people belongs not only to itself. Each people belongs to the world, and the peoples have a shared blood supply.

When this blood supply is disrupted, the entire organism falls sick. That this is so, is indicated by a telegram I received the other day, which I consider it my duty as a deputy to read out:

"To USSR People's Deputies Yanis Peters and Valentin Rasputin, Congress of People's Deputies, Moscow. Please raise the question of the expediency of the construction of the Katunskaya Hydroelectric Power Station, which is a threat to the survival of the Altai ethnic group. [Signed] V. Kydyev, journalist; Gyuzel Yelemova, poet; S. Kergilov, teacher; M. Tolbina, scientific staffer; A. Tolkachkov, trainer; A. Tadinov, artist; V. Tolkachenov, physician; A. Tyukhteneva, physician."

It is terrible to read such a text, but it is even more terrible to realize that aggressive planning is continuing its crusade against the existence of peoples.

In speaking of the tragedy in Latvia we should, of course, seek the roots in the tragedy of the Russians, Belorussians, Ukrainians, the tragedy of other peoples of the Soviet Union. It is not just for the fun of it that people

leave Russian or Belorussian socially oppressed territories, their own sacred lands, and take refuge in the Baltic region, where, without being personally culpable, they are drawn against their will into the creation of a demographic imbalance and an ethnopsychologically unhealthy climate, and the destruction of the national identity and statehood of the union republics. All this destabilizes the political situation and reduces the prestige of the communist parties of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

It must be admitted that for decades the USSR Government and the Latvian SSR Government violated Article 76 of the USSR Constitution, which states very simply: "A union republic is a sovereign Soviet socialist state that has united with other Soviet republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." I can already hear people saying: "But things are even worse in Russia—Baykal is dying, the birth rate is falling, disease is on the increase, morality is dying...." Yes; I do not deny it, and I believe that the all-union administrative team, including the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan], also violates the sovereignty of the RSFSR and the interests of all the peoples of Russia, including the interests of the Russian people and the aforementioned Altai. But the fact that things are even worse in Russia is no consolation for the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians, and no reason to expect equally bad times in the Baltic region. Why should we be compared with less developed regions? Compare us with Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark. And if we do not want anti-Russian, anti-Latvian, anti-Lithuanian, anti-Estonian, anti-Semitic, anti-Armenian, anti-Georgian, even anti-Islamic, or anti-anything else feelings to develop, let us really carry out radical restructuring on questions of interethnic relations and the status of the union republic as a sovereign state.

Every schoolboy who has studied grammar knows that sovereignty is virtually synonymous with "independence." So why are we so afraid of this word? Why is Russia afraid of becoming independent of all-union diktat? Why is official Latvia afraid of it? (Unofficial Latvia is no longer afraid of anyone or anything.) Why have we begun to be officially afraid of each other? Why are we afraid of what we ourselves wrote into the Constitution—I quote Article 80: "A union republic has the right to enter into relations with foreign states, conclude treaties with them and exchange diplomatic and consular missions, and participate in the activity of international organizations?"

We are not used to it? Let us admit that at the moment this is true. But I think the time is not far off when Article 81 of the USSR Constitution will also be brought into play—it states: "The sovereign rights of the union republics are protected by the USSR." I am convinced that the USSR should not shrink from coming out in defense of the sovereignty, that is, the independence of the union republics. After all, what is the USSR? It is you

and I, each of the 15 constitutionally—but unfortunately, as yet only theoretically—independent states. Only the true independence of these states, with certain restrictions on independence, as is observed in all federal unions, can bring us out of the political, economic, ecological, and national crisis, out of the impasse of moral decline, at this historic moment. The national potential of each people could give a decisive boost to a general economic revival, because national self-awareness, national statehood consists first and foremost of the devout feelings of sons and daughters toward their mother, the motherland, the people who are your family. But the family has the right to lay down order in its own home, and to define the place in that home for its dear relatives, who are, moreover, not relatives at all according to the ethnic principle. In the Baltic family this principle has never dominated. Russian, Belorussian, German, Jewish, Polish, Swedish, and Finnish blood flows in our veins. All we want is not to become lodgers in our own home.

If the center is strong, it should protect us strongly against tyranny, otherwise all it does is to demonstrate strongly its weakness. The new USSR Supreme Soviet should justify on legal principles the stationing of the Army in the union republics. If it has not yet become possible to reduce to a minimum the strength of Army subunits and naval bases in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, or to do away with them entirely in the name of disarmament, then the situation can only be improved by means of an open [glasnyy] contract between the USSR Defense Ministry on the one hand and the union republic Council of Ministers on the other. This contract should stipulate openly what category of troops, in which places, in what numbers, and for what period are deployed in the republic. The concluded contract should be submitted to the republic Supreme Soviet for ratification. New articles should be introduced accordingly into the USSR Constitution and the union republic constitutions, on the relations between the Army and the supreme power in each union republic. Official statutes should be drawn up in addition on the economic, ecological, and cultural behavior of Army subunits, institutions, and departments, soldiers, and officers. I think the military should pass a test in the minimum basic knowledge of the history, traditions, and way of life of the people among whom they will be living for a certain time under the contract. The contract should guarantee a ban on the show of strength for the purposes of psychological intimidation of citizens. Otherwise the mentality of a citizen of the military district, rather than the country, develops among servicemen.

Comrade deputies! As a result of the February and October 1917 revolution, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia acquired national statehood. In 1940 Stalin and his emissaries, Vyshinskiy, Dekanozov, and Zhdanov, the butchers of the peoples, including the Russian people, promised us socialist happiness. It turned out that this was the crude, savage Stalin-Hitler deal on the distribution of spheres of influence. We all are very well aware

that you cannot go back to 1939 and start over, but we also are aware that socialism should be synonymous with self-determination for nations and independence for states. It is characteristic that on 25 May, the opening day of the Congress of People's Deputies, PRAVDA published the theses drawn up by the commission of scientists from the USSR and Poland, which say: "In the process of adoption and implementation of decisions, including the 28 September treaty, the Soviet Government committed serious violations of international legal norms. First and foremost we note that the 28 September treaty, which stipulated the extreme eastern limit of the Wehrmacht's advance with a commitment on the part of Germany at state level, was called not only a treaty on the 'border,' but also a 'friendship' treaty, which provided grounds for speaking of 'friendly' relations between the USSR and fascist Germany, in effect whitewashed fascism, distorted class principles in the public and individual consciousness, and had grave consequences for both Poland and the USSR; the treaty flouted Leninist principles and struck a blow against the international workers' movement."

Comrades! Our delegations simply have no right to go back to Riga, Vilnius, and Tallinn without a promise that the USSR's highest legislators will instruct the USSR Government to take all the necessary measures to denounce the unlawful international legal document of 1939, because it is a question of Mankurtism, that phenomenon that was so precisely defined by Chingiz Aytmatov. Remember, a Mankurt is a man who has lost his memory, and is therefore ready to shoot his own mother dead, because he does not recognize her.

The whole world is watching today to see whether the Latvian will shoot his mother Latvia, whether the Lithuanian will shoot his mother Lithuania and the Estonian his mother Estonia, by renouncing their own true history under pressure. The whole world will also watch the commission we have set up, which is called upon to restore the historical memory of the peoples, not in the name of the glorious gains of Russia, but in the name of the preservation of life and the rights of national self-determination for the three peace-loving peoples on the shores of the Baltic Sea.

I appeal to Comrades Gorbachev, Yakovlev, and Shevardnadze right now, at the time of the rebirth of the new society that we all so badly need, to become personally involved in unraveling this historical knot.

And in conclusion—although this is not a congress of communists—about the party. Yes, the party won a victory in the elections, but it also suffered a defeat. It is characteristic that the vast majority of those who became people's deputies are those communists who linked their future with the people's and civil movements for democracy, and also with the idea of national rebirth.

Why was Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev elected president of the USSR almost without an alternative candidacy? Obviously the secret is very simple—the leader of the Soviet Union's communists has resolutely taken the people's side and occupied a position of democratic transformations, and is trying to turn the party into a champion of the peoples' interests and to make the party's activity an integral part of the people's movement. Obviously this is the only way for communists if they wish to claim the role of a progressive political force.

This is also indicated by the phenomenon of the disobedient communist, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, for whom we found a place on the Supreme Soviet after all.

But how can we say that the nonparty candidates lost the elections? When we see today among the most respected and genuine people's deputies the conscience of the Russian intelligentsia, Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, what right do we have to speak of a defeat for the nonparty people? So who won, in the end? I will dare to take the responsibility for saying that for the first time after decades of humiliation, it was a victory for the people, democracy, and the desire to begin the creation of an association of independent rule-of-law states.

One last thing: I would like to remind the presidium that a question from Latvian SSR deputies on the fate of the Crimean Tatars has been in the presidium for some days now. Thank you. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: Deputy Viktor Amazaspovich Ambartsumyan has the floor. Comrade Khudonazarov should prepare himself.

V.A. Ambartsumyan, president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences (Ashtarakskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Armenian SSR): Comrade deputies! At the end of last year Soviet Armenia suffered a disaster on a gigantic scale. An earthquake of enormous destructive power afflicted the whole area from Leninakan to Kirovakan and all the adjoining regions. Nearly half a million people were left homeless as a result of the tragedy. Winters in the Leninakan region—I say this for the benefit of those who have no idea that Armenia is terribly diverse in terms of climatic zones—can be severe, and the situation was extremely grave. In that difficult, troubled time we received generous assistance from all the republics and oblasts of the Soviet Union. All the peoples of the world, states, and governments gave Armenia moral and material support, which we will never forget.

Since the whole of our country and the whole world are watching our first Congress of People's Deputies closely, I will take this opportunity to express most profound gratitude to all the Soviet peoples and the citizens of the world for this mighty and, I would say, unprecedented manifestation of human solidarity. (Applause).

The city of Spitak—the epicenter of the earthquake of which nothing remains—has become a symbol of human goodness.

Armenia bows to you, people of the planet. Unfortunately, we also experienced much else that was distressing last year, we had other grave trials, too. In early March 1988 we received thousands of refugees who were fleeing not an earthquake, but the violence in Sumgait. Many people see the name of that city as a symbol of national enmity. I do not want it to be like that, because I very much respect the labor of many thousands of Azerbaijanis, Russians, and Armenians who together built this young industrial center, which, incidentally, has its problems, too. But we must ensure that Sumgait does not happen again.

Esteemed Deputy Azizbekova has sketched a picture of Azerbaijani-Armenian friendship. This friendship has indeed had a long history, but she omitted to say how the events in Sumgait fit in with this friendship. It must be recognized that internationalism is not only a matter of words; it only gains strength from real deeds.

Throughout last year and the early part of this year we learned daily of the troubles of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh, whose oppression has lasted for decades, and which was removed unlawfully from Armenia.

All this is a grave blow against the unity of the Soviet Union's peoples. Yet that unity is the guarantee, the main guarantee, of our country's future. And comrades, let us cherish and strengthen this unity. And although what I have said also implies criticism of our country's central organs, which do not do enough to protect our society against interethnic clashes and oppression, all the same I do not advocate the weakening of central organs. But I demand that they work better and stop helping those forces that seek to weaken the unity of our peoples.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the argument about the rights that should belong to the center and to the periphery—the great discussion about this—is not being conducted quite correctly. After all, the leadership and the apparatus of power are created solely to serve the people. That is their sacred duty. And in order to fulfill their duties well they should be clearly defined and separated. A clear and precise allocation of duties and functions is absolutely essential. We must know precisely what each of us is responsible for.

And what happens? When any shortcoming is uncovered in our work, when anything bad happens, as is so frequently the case, the same question always arises: Who is to blame? If everyone knew precisely what he is responsible for, that is, knew his duties precisely, then after such an event we would see a resignation, the resignation of the civil servant concerned, that is, the one with the relevant duties. Incidentally, for some reason we regard "civil servant" ["chinovnik"] as a rude word. But no, a civil servant is first and foremost a person who

carries out quite specific duties that are entrusted to him. For some reason we have come to accept their renaming. And they have begun increasingly to forget that they have duties; they are glad that they are no longer called civil servants, and they think more about their rights than their duties.

At the same time the distribution of duties should be in accordance with the people's needs, and should not arouse their suspicion. When a clear demarcation of duties is set between the center and the republics, then it will be possible to distribute rights in accordance with duties—and this should be done. I do not mean that duties alone are needed first, and rights only later. This is, of course, a single process. But duties should be clarified first and foremost with regard to the people. And then it should be decided, so to speak, what rights are necessary for the fulfillment of these duties, and only these duties.

If you go into the Karabakh question, the reason for the dispute becomes clear. In the consciousness of the Armenian people the unlawful, unconditional removal of Karabakh from Armenia in the twenties was also based on the principle that the most important thing is to gain rights. To begin the de-Armenianization of that territory. And when the de-Armenianization is completed, as has already been done in Nakhichevan, then let them say what they like. All the same, it will be a fait accompli by then. The question of the final normalization of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh can only be resolved on the basis of the principle of the peoples' self-determination. Life itself has shown that the Leninist principle of self-determination of nations is the only means of resolving such issues. And this will, of course, be in the spirit of restructuring.

Comrades, great significance is attached to the foreign policy questions to which the second part of Mikhail Sergeyevich's report was devoted. Here our country has achieved successes on a truly worldwide scale. These arose from the introduction of the new thinking. This thinking and its introduction led to the lessening of tension throughout the world. That is greatly to our country's credit.

Our troops have been withdrawn from Afghanistan. I believe that throughout this sphere full approval of our government's activity can be expressed. (Applause). But we ask our government also constantly to take into account the fact that not only the Union as a whole, but each of the Union's peoples, has its own external interests, not only economically, but also politically. Some examples.

First. When Foreign Minister (former, of course) Molotov once declared on behalf of the Armenian people that they renounce their claims to the restoration of the Kars region [now in Turkey] and the territory where, as the whole world knows, the 1915 genocide was carried out, he was not telling the truth. He mercilessly flouted the feelings and

interests of one of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The Armenian people are in favor of peace. No one proposes to use force on this matter, but we hope that the question will find a peaceful solution in the future.

Another example. A number of foreign states, as well as the European Parliament, have officially acknowledged and condemned the genocide of Armenians in 1915 by Ottoman Turkey. The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet recently adopted a decision to request that the USSR Supreme Soviet officially condemn the extermination of the Armenian people in Turkey in 1915. That would be as just as the condemnation of the deportation of the Tatars from the Crimea.

I wish to make one more brief, but important observation here. Many of us representatives of outlying republics have spoken here about our peoples' national feelings, and in particular of cases where national consciousness has been injured. Yes, there is much suffering and many injuries in our shared history. But in this atmosphere of justified demands and reminders of our own grief, it is incumbent on us to pay due tribute to the amazing staunchness of the Russian people—the people who suffered numerous losses in the Great Patriotic War and endured the horrors of depeasantization and de-Cossackization, showing exemplary industriousness, creative initiative, and love for other peoples. Whether we like it or not, the Russian people are placed in a position where they bear the heaviest burden, the heaviest duties, which they cannot shrug off, by virtue of their position. At a congress such as the present first Congress of People's Deputies, this observation on the part of representatives of all the peoples living in the union republics will, I hope, be deemed entirely apposite. (Applause).

Comrades, allow me to express the hope that at least some of the questions we have raised will be resolved in the process of this congress' work. (Applause).

A.I. Lukyanov: The floor is turned over to Deputy Khudonazarov. Next up will be Deputy Chervonopiskiy.

D. Khudonazarov, first secretary of the board of the Tajik SSR Cinematographers Union, city of Dushanbe (Khorog National-Territorial Election District, Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast): Esteemed Comrade Chairman! Esteemed comrade deputies! I have the distinct honor of representing, along with other deputies here, the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast, which is located in the Pamirs. Allow me first of all to address a few words directly to my constituents.

Dear countrymen! Believe me, I have not forgotten our problems, our troubles, our discomposure. But I won't be speaking of them today. Today I need to talk about what concerns and unites our whole Union, the worries and hopes we share. Along with our credentials, we have been given by you constituents the responsibility for the fate of every one of you and all of us together.

Responsibility—that's what I want to focus on first. Day before yesterday, Deputy Yu. P. Vlasov voiced the idea of the possibility of calling anyone to account before the people's representatives (that is, before all of society), regardless of the post he holds. But how are we to exercise this requirement when we lack the mechanism by which legislative authority, which guarantees public order in the state, might control the executive organs of that authority? Without a mechanism of control, we enable any official to shift responsibility for concrete actions onto a subordinate. As a result, a decision concerning actions that have consequences for the whole state can be taken at any level. And then there is the possibility, at any level, to "wash one's hands."

If we look at the tragedy of 9 April from this standpoint, we can see that for all the dissimilarity in the specific circumstances and people involved, the events in Tbilisi are of the same order with Chernobyl, the Aral Sea, Sumgait, and Lake Baykal. There is no guarantee that this sad series will not be extended.

The responsibility which we took upon ourselves when we received the mandates of authority from the people must also be extended to all our executive organs and each individual executive officer. Only by doing so and finding the mechanism to demand equally from them and from ourselves can we manifest genuine respect for the principle of collective authority and for the personality of the state official. I ask that you examine the formation of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision through this prism.

Secondly, a matter of great urgency: It is essential right now, while the events are still fresh, to review the experience of the recent elections, to take account of all defects, errors, and violations. Many, very many of our constituents are bitter about the candidates' lack of equal rights. For some candidates, the apparatus rolled out the red carpet; for others, it erected hurdles. Far from being punished, those who violated the principle of equal rights—the fundamental principle of democracy—have not even been charged. The first lessons of our new electoral system must be taken account of immediately in order to guarantee genuine democratic conditions for elections to the supreme soviets of the republics and the local soviets. (Applause).

Local authority is most visible to the people; millions are in touch with it, and trust in the higher levels of authority starts there. The more competently and freely the local deputies express the will of the constituents, the more effective our and your activities will be. The bitter experience of history proves that puppets do not help the government, they tie its hands. Right now, at this congress, we must pass an amendment to the Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the USSR. We must reject district assemblies which serve as filters for candidates who are undesirable to the apparatus. (Applause). Recent experience has shown that only through direct elections in two rounds can we protect

against the despotism and injustice which give rise to social apathy, feelings of bitterness and frustration, distrust of authority, and deepening crisis.

My proposal: to include under Miscellaneous on the agenda a discussion of the Law on Elections and amend it in accordance with the experience we have gained.

Thirdly, we have elected a USSR Supreme Soviet at the present congress. I was also deeply saddened by the fact that many deputies who showed themselves to be competent politicians during the pre-congress period were left out of the Supreme Soviet. During the proceedings of congress we have all experienced an acute shortage of jurists in our ranks. There should be considerably more of them. Whenever we hit a snag, we look around for Deputy A. A. Sobchak. By autumn we will have accumulated the minimum experience to enable us to begin rotation without waiting for the following year. It is essential that the Supreme Soviet become a genuine, vigorous organ of state authority so that in the course of five years our ranks will produce workers, peasants, and members of the intelligentsia who have proved themselves as real politicians. In connection with this, I urge you, my colleagues, not to engage any more in artificially opposing the workers to the intelligentsia. It could create a new nucleus of senseless tension. (Applause).

Further, I agree with Deputy Sh.A. Amonashvili that national sensibilities and interethnic relations are the most troublesome sore points in the social organism. This applies both to the larger and the smaller peoples. An insult to national honor is incomparably greater than an insult to an individual. It is tantamount to an insult to our parents and our children at the same time, an insult to the whole cycle of generations in the past and the future. Interethnic tension in many areas of our country did not come into being today or 70 years ago; sometimes it has grown over the centuries. Such conflicts are caused not only by ethnic but also religious, territorial, and psychological factors. Any so-called "preventive measures" in this sphere must be undertaken with extreme caution! Any coercion, any aggression immediately provokes a reaction whose potential energy has been accumulating for centuries. The only permissible preventive measure is democracy—that is, tolerance, willingness to listen to and understand the other person, openness to any investigation and discussion, local self-government and effective guarantees to protect sovereignty on the part of Central authority.

In contemplating the recent tragedies in the sphere of national policies and interethnic relations, I am increasingly worried because we have neither a genuinely historical nor a long-range concept in this sphere, and, consequently, we do not have legislative guarantees or effective levers for resolving conflicts. Even the simple truth that national and economic relations are interconnected is ignored because of the shortsightedness of many local (and not just local) officials.

I think it is necessary to cite two examples of how tension in regional and national relations is born and built up. It is inseparable from economic and political problems. The Pamirs make up the highest mountain region in the country, where the average elevation of inhabited territory is more than 3000 meters above sea level, where mountain peaks top out above 7000 meters, and minimum temperatures go down to -63 degrees Celsius. People live in extreme conditions almost all year round. Added to these natural difficulties is economic and social deprivation. The road that links the oblast to Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan, is closed throughout the long winter. Difficult meteorological conditions the year round lead to irregularity in air connections. For this reason, it has been decided to build another road connecting Khorog, Kalai-Khumb, and Kulyab. But at the rate the construction is going—it has been under construction for 10 years now—it will not be completed until the third millennium. Yet old-timers recall how, a half-century ago, with the help of fraternal peoples, they built a road to Dushanbe almost by hand in... 110 days. The indifference of the Central ministry not only deprives the region of a vitally essential link with the country but also creates a cluster of problems in which negative energy is building up.

Another example. At present, an average of 93 percent of the population of the Pamirs watches the Central Television program via the space satellite system. But Pamirians are deprived of the opportunity to watch Tajik Television, and in Murgab Rayon, which is inhabited by Kirghiz as well, there is no reception of broadcasts from Kirghiz Television. Not only that, there are no special correspondents for republic television in the Pamirs, correspondents who could report regularly to the whole region on the life, social problems, and cultural wealth of the Pamir districts. As a result, there is an increasing gap between the two parts of a single nation. It is aggravated by the fact that, while the Pamirians and the lowland Tajiks have common ethnic roots, they speak different languages. Normal cultural communications used to foster the multilingualism that was common to regions of Central Asia. Now, however, the Pamirians are not always perceived by the lowland Tajiks as being a kindred part of the nation with equal rights. In the mountains, on the other hand, fewer people know the common Tajik language, which creates additional difficulties in schooling, in labor, and in the distribution of material, social, and cultural benefits. Meanwhile, broadcasting republic television programs via satellite to Gornyy Badakhshan, to the rest of the territory of Tajikistan, and to the other republics of Central Asia would obviously cost less in every respect than the present mutual isolation.

Thus, economic short-sightedness has brought about growing national problems. And errors in national policies have brought about economic backwardness. It is obvious now that it is impossible to solve economic problems without raising social awareness, and the latter is impossible without shaping national awareness.

National awareness embodies a force of enormous magnitude, comparable to nuclear energy. But, like nuclear energy, it can be used to build or to destroy. Neglectfulness, carelessness, or unwise playing upon selfish interests in this sphere can lead to catastrophes comparable to Chernobyl. We have already learned several tragic lessons. Any escalation of nationalist tendencies, insistence on one's superiority and exclusiveness, and any absence of national self-criticism can lead to self-oblivion rather than self-awareness. And, again, the only salvation from explosion is the further development of democracy. Democracy means more than pluralism of opinions and complete freedom to discuss them; it also requires the ability to reach the kind of compromise that satisfies all sides. It is the art of achieving unity, but not a unity that is mechanical and homogenizes the multiplicity of interests and aspirations. Democracy is also self-discipline. There are those who interpret discipline as obedience, but in fact it is the readiness to take responsibility upon oneself, to answer for the consequences of one's actions in accordance with conscience and the law. One leader of the human rights movement in America has said: "If you're not ready to be part of the solution, you are almost certainly part of the problem." In considering the necessity of broad discussion of the entire complex of interethnic problems in their theoretical, political, legislative, and economic aspects, it must be deemed essential that the work of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on National Questions be participated in by communist deputies, members of the future commission on interethnic relations. From now on, in my opinion, it should be a rule that members of certain commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet routinely take part, with the right of a consultative vote, in Central Committee plenums concerning these themes.

For the first time in many decades, the people are touching the levers of state power directly through their representatives. We are standing on the threshold of the house of a

state of law. With our very first steps we must restore the rights of one more category. It is classified among those universal human values which the chairman of our Supreme Soviet has mentioned repeatedly as one of the highest criteria of our new life. I refer to the category of honor. It cannot be introduced legislatively; it can be acknowledged voluntarily as a moral principle. Honor and responsibility are inseparable. If you refuse to avow responsibility, you acknowledge the permissibility of shifting your own possible dishonor onto others who are less guilty or absolutely innocent, and in the long run, onto your state, your people. Woe unto us if we again consent to this! Finally in recent years, party and law enforcement organs have carried out broad rehabilitation of the victims of the potentates who cynically rejected honor as a personal or state category. Among the millions of peasants, workers, and members of the intelligentsia who perished innocently, there were many delegates to eight all-union congresses of soviets, and almost all the members of their central executive committees. They departed this life as "enemies of the people." I cannot help thinking that the agony of dishonor was more terrible to them than physical torment. Death in dishonor must have horrified them, because honor is more precious than life. After we have restored legal and political innocence to the martyrs, we people's deputies must restore honor to all our fellow citizens who perished innocently, and hence to ourselves and our children as well. By doing so we will swear fidelity to the inner moral law of honor without which our state cannot flourish.

I ask the chairman to propose that everyone in this hall signify by standing that they swear fidelity to the inner law of honor, without which our country cannot flourish. (Applause).

(Continuation of the stenographic report will be published in the next edition).